

# THE HOMILETIC REVIEW.

VOL. XXII.—SEPTEMBER, 1891.—No. 3.

## REVIEW SECTION.

### I.—THE PENTATEUCHAL DISCUSSION—PRESENT OUTLOOK.

By PROFESSOR EDWIN C. BISSELL, D.D., HARTFORD, CONN.

BEFORE the present discussion began, a definite theory of the origin and structure of the Pentateuch (or Hexateuch) can scarcely be said to have existed. It was simply held, in a general way, that it came from Moses. Those who hold substantially to the same opinion have now a much clearer conception of what they mean when they say that it came from Moses. They do not deny that Moses is likely to have had documentary sources of information—mostly, however, in Genesis—of which he made considerable use; that he may have had the help of historiographers, possibly professional, in bringing the books to their present form; that the last part of Deuteronomy, as well as Joshua, were written after his death; or that all the books, but especially Genesis, contain evident traces of editorial supervision, apparently intended to render certain geographical and other obscure statements more intelligible, although they maintain, as suggested, that such editorial matter is mostly obvious in itself and of very limited extent. They do not deny that there are different codes of laws, three in number, in the Pentateuch, whose *immediate* circumstances and purpose are unlike. But they hold, with no less tenacity than ever, that the Pentateuch is properly Mosaic in that, essentially, it arose in his age, was, at least in part, written by him, and bears throughout the stamp of his personality and masterly hand; that its different strata of laws are in perfect harmony with one another when the circumstances of their original promulgation in the Mosaic period and their immediate object are sufficiently considered;\* and they stand firmly by the historical character of the matter of these books and the strictly literal interpretation to be put upon such expressions as “the Lord spake unto Moses,” etc.

The theory which has arisen to dispute the way with this original and, until now, almost universally prevalent one, offers also the boldest contrasts

\* See the writer's paper on “The Codes” in “Moses and his Recent Critics,” Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 1889.

with it. It is evolutionary in principle, and, it cannot well be denied, revolutionary in its results. It holds that the Hexateuch is a growth of many centuries, from the more or less mythical period of Moses to the Babylonian exile. Its three codes of laws belong to different epochs of Israelitish history, the earliest of them not arising until hundreds of years after the time of Moses and the Exodus. Its narrative matter, properly distributed, goes mostly with the laws, as a multitude of anachronisms, contradictions, and efforts at editorial adjustment show. In short, the Hexateuch is a compilation from three different works—subordinating a minor distinction—themselves much modified from their original form, and belonging to wholly different authors and widely different periods. A redactor united them together as they now appear, being guided by the principle of preserving, as far as possible, each intact within the limits of verisimilitude, but without intending, apparently, to vouch for the historicity of anything. Most of the references to Moses, the wilderness, and utterances of Jehovah are mere literary accommodations. The only safe guide in seeking for the facts underlying and mixed up with numerous misstatements and anachronisms is the principle of historical criticism as it is applied in the examination of other ancient books.

Such, in briefest outline, are the two sharply antagonistic theories now confronting each other. Until disproved and displaced, however, the former holds the field. The burden of proof rests plainly on the adherents of the later one. This should be clearly understood. There is a widespread effort to give a contrary impression. The new theory has won for itself so numerous a following, especially in Germany, that the claim of superiority and of victory is already made for it. But that by no means follows. It is a question to be settled by convincing arguments rather than by votes. It is not to be forgotten that German scholars have taken positions with as bold a front before, which they have found themselves unable to defend. The history of similar movements shows the value of caution and deliberation. Even a far less radical change of attitude toward the Scriptures than that now demanded should only be made for the most satisfactory reasons.

Moreover, by what prerogative do scholars assume thus to settle offhand, as it were, and behind the backs of the Christian people of these several lands, a question which so vitally concerns them? A cardinal principle of Protestantism is, that the Bible is a book for the people. It has no merely esoteric problems, whether critical or practical. Certainly these, which so directly involve the value and authority of the Scriptures, are not of that sort. If the new theory can be properly defended at all, the line of defence can be made plain to ordinary minds; to the sensible and devout men and women of our churches as well as their spiritual leaders. Such an effort has never yet been successfully made.

Still further, the final test by which one theory or the other will find acceptance will be that it best accounts for *all the facts*. The theory

itself, be it remembered, is not the thing to be chiefly considered. It is no special recommendation of a new machine that it is new ; that it falls in with current ideas ; that it is constructed on supposed scientific principles ; or even that it has the approval of experts. A more important question is, Will it work ? Does it do the thing required of it better than another ? And the question here is, What is the relation of this new theory to the whole sum of recorded facts ? Does it give them order and meaning as no other one can ?

Having premised so much of what should be generally conceded, what is the present outlook ? Is it possible to forecast, with any degree of certainty, the final result ? Unless I am mistaken, there are certain indications which are tolerably conclusive. I must content myself in this brief paper with naming a few, and mostly such as have become prominent in recent phases of the discussion.

1. *The attitude of the new theory toward supernaturalism in the Bible and a revealed religion.* They are either quietly ignored, or the biblical statements at their basis are openly flouted by its representative leaders. Kuenen, for example, frankly avows that the purpose with which he sets out is to show a natural development (*i.e.*, in distinction from supernaturalism) not only of the religion of Israel, but also of the belief that it was a divine revelation.\* Wellhausen stoutly affirms that the statements of the Bible which imply a church for Israel (*i.e.*, the ceremonial law) at the beginning of its history is unhistorical and contrary to the true tradition.† On leaving his chair of theology at Greifswald, a few years since, he acknowledged that he no longer stood on the basis of Protestantism and the Evangelical Church.‡ Stade energetically protests against applying to the Old Testament religion that canon of Schleiermacher's, that the peculiar essence of a religion is expressed most purely at its source. He calls it a false generalization from the single example of Christianity.§ But if he admitted that the religion of the Old Testament, as well as that of the New, is a revealed religion, the one example would be quite sufficient. These three men have been pronounced the greatest Old Testament critics living.|| They are among the originators and most prominent supporters of the new theory. All of them, as not a few of their colleagues, and of the rank and file, thus formally and deliberately set aside, at the start, some of the most essential facts of the Bible in forming a theory of its contents. These facts have confessedly an equal support with those they accept ; but their theory flatly refuses to accommodate itself to them. And that is one of the most vital and serious aspects of the matter. The personal views of these men would be of little account if they were not representative. They are strictly so, and the new theory, in its present

\* "The Religion of Israel" (London, 1874), p. 10.

† "Geschichte," p. 267.

‡ Schaff's "Encyclopedia of Living Divines," *s. r.*

§ Montefiore, "Recent Criticism upon Moses," *The Jewish Quarterly Review* (Jan., 1891), p. 275.

|| *Ibid.*

form, would be impossible without this sweeping assumption. I am aware that others think differently. English and American scholars of repute speak of it as theologically "neutral;" declare that it does not "affect the fact of revelation,"\* and that its results are "harmless."† They seem to me to overlook as well some of the principal postulates of the theory as the main line of argument by which it is supported; and to separate, in a wholly unwarranted way, between its premises and their necessary conclusion. Otherwise they must hold peculiar views of what a written "revelation" is, and what is "neutral" and "harmless" in theories concerning the Bible.

"Every day of my life," says Principal Rainy, "I fall in with critical opinions which I find myself dismissing from my mind as opinions which I am not going to adopt, partly no doubt because I don't think it likely any strong evidence will be found in support of them; but partly also because, whatever presumptions could be pleaded for them, I rate highly the presumptions arising against them, from their apparent incongruity with what appears to me to be a sound and reasonable view of the Bible."‡ Now any "sound and reasonable" view of the Bible must admit its supernatural character in every part. Unless, therefore, the day is at hand, said to be predicted by Mrs. Humphry Ward, when not to reject the miraculous in Christianity will be as *outré* and heretical as the reverse now is, any system of criticism which contests or ignores it is foredoomed to failure.

2. *The complexity of the proposed theory in itself and the obscure and intricate processes by which it is supported.* It has been before the public a considerable number of years; but the scholars who can state in detail what it is and the arguments urged in its favor and against it are few indeed, and mostly confined to one department of study. Cheyne thinks that on this very ground the exclusion of these "critical theories from purely popular theology is for the present fully justifiable. "Look," he says, "at our excellent apologists pounding away at Wellhausen! How can they expect to master, much less refute, one of the most elaborate specimens of advanced criticism?"§ It is highly significant that a recent writer, himself an Old Testament scholar of note, and posing as a critic of the theory, fails to understand some of its main features.¶ Edersheim, who might be considered a fairly competent judge, says that while it is a credit to the ingenuity of its author, "common sense instinctively rejects it as incredible. A work so elaborately tessellated, into which so many different documents, redacted and re-redacted, have been so cunningly

\* Driver, "Critical Notes on the International Sunday-school Lessons" (New York, 1887), pp. 7, 8.

† Cheyne, *Contemporary Review* (Aug., 1889), p. 221.

‡ "The Bible and Criticism" (London, 1878), p. 137.

§ *Contemporary Review* (Aug., 1889), p. 223.

¶ Wright, "Introduction to the Old Testament," *cf.* Strack, *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, Feb. 27, 1891.

inserted, that one piece breaks off in the middle of a chapter or even of a verse, to which a piece from a different document is joined, and so on till the mind becomes bewildered amid documents and redactions—such a piece of literary mosaic has never been done, so far as we know, and we refuse to believe that it could have been done.” \*

For some years it has been my custom to devote, in my classes, not less than an hour a week for two semesters to this subject, with men trained in our best colleges, with the result that even the brightest of them, in that time, fail to get much more than a superficial view of it. What, then, is to be said of the laity? We have already seen that it is no less their question than that of professional scholars. They must be brought to a fair understanding of it or they will not adopt it, and ought not to do so. True, it is not certain evidence that a theory is false because it is difficult to understand and communicate; but, on the other hand, it is very strong evidence, especially when it involves the authority of the Scriptures of the Old or the New Testament. The degree to which it is complex is pretty sure here to mark the degree of its departure from the truth. And when it is considered that even in its present complicated form it concerns itself, as we have seen, with only a portion of the facts, not to be simple and clear as far as it goes is to fail in the first and chief object of a theory.

3. *Its past history.* It is not long, but it is long enough to have described a circle, and to be now engaged in revolving in it. Its head and tail are not only in dangerous proximity, but it has made a promising beginning toward devouring itself. Wellhausen acknowledges his great indebtedness to Vatke, † but Vatke, on further reflection, retracted many of the views on which Wellhausen builds. ‡ There seems to be no forwardness on the part of Wellhausen or his colleagues to call attention to and make use of these retractions. Eichhorn, from whom all subsequent critics derived their main principles, was a valiant defender of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch, supporting his opinion by arguments which have never been answered. § The tangential lines of later critics have nearly all begun with what he considered simply incidental and relatively unimportant glosses and interpolations. I have just finished reading Ewald's "Composition of Genesis," ¶ in which he supports its literary unity by reasoning as conclusive as it is free from the suspicion of "bigotry" or "traditionalism," which would attach to the person who should now use it. The same may be said in general of Tuch, whose "Commentary on Genesis" appeared as late as 1838.

Now there has been no change in the essential facts since the early part of the present century, or even in the capacity for discovering them. He would be a bold man who would claim an insight for Kuenen and Well-

\* "Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah" (London, 1885), p. 209; cf., for a similar judgment, Mead, *Journal of Bib. Literature*, Part I., 1891, pp. 44-54.

† "Geschichte," p. 4.

‡ "Historisch-Kritische Einleitung," etc., 1886.

§ "Einleitung" (1823), vol. 3.

¶ "Die Composition d. Gen.," Braunschweig, 1823.

hausen which was not possessed by Ewald and Eichhorn. There has been simply a change of position ; that is sufficient to account for all the other changes. A recent writer on the criticism has named his valuable *brochure* "The Battle of the Standpoints."\* Under the banner of biblical criticism scholars are really engaged in the contests of philosophy. Of course there can be no objection to such contests ; none could be more vital. But let the real issue be apparent ! What I wrote some years ago I see no reasons for changing, but additional ones for repeating and emphasizing still more strongly. It is not a better scholarship or a sharper critical acumen that has brought about so radical and revolutionary a change. It is the growing influence of the teaching of naturalistic evolution.†

4. *The present disagreements of its advocates.* Great unanimity is claimed in the matter of the analysis of the documents. But one has only to get the facts before him as they appear in the notes of Bacon's recent articles,‡ to discover that this unanimity is far enough from being complete ; that, in fact, the differences in themselves, strictly considered, fatally vitiate the principles on which the analysis is based. The Book of Deuteronomy is usually assigned to the time of Josiah (n.c. 621), but a disposition is discovering itself to characterize it as a collection of fragments, and to date it subsequent to the Babylonian exile.§ It is well known that a considerable number of leading critics have never given their assent to the view of Graf, Wellhausen, and others, that the document known as P (Priests' Code), making up about one half of the Hexateuch, arose after the exile, or even, in its main features, after Deuteronomy. The list includes such names as Richm, Dillmann, Strack, Nöldeke, Bredenkamp, Baudissen, König, Kittel, and, in part, Delitzsch. It would seem, accordingly, that our critics have not yet found a generally accepted criterion for determining either the age or the proper succession of the documents supposed to make up the Hexateuch. Just now a still more radical dissension has arisen. A leading critic has ventured an attack on the most fundamental conceptions of the system, going even to the extreme of persiflage and ridicule. Klostermann,|| Professor at Kiel, characterizes the ideas held and the use made of the "Redactor" as quite preposterous ; holds that the criticism has gone too far in building so exclusively on the analysis of Genesis, as well as in ignoring to such an extent the different theories of Deuteronomy ; that the so-called separate documents

\* Cave, "The Battle of the Standpoints," Lond., 1890.

† "The Pentateuch," etc. (New York, 1885), p. 252. Cf. Darmesteter's review of Renan's "Les Prophètes d'Israel," etc., in the April number of the *Revue des deux Mondes*, where the religion of the Old Testament is characterized as "a progressive revelation which has its source in the heart of man, which comes from the ardent meditations of a few seers, which has been slowly developed, transformed and adjusted to the size of humanity, and in which we see how the people of Israel, instead of being the chosen of God themselves, created God, as it were, by the very sweat of their brow."

‡ *Hebraica*, from July, 1888.

§ Horst, "Revue de l'Histoire des Religions" (1887), pp. 28-65 ; Vernes, "Une Nouvelle Hypothèse," etc., 1887.

|| *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 1890, Hefte 9, 10.

of the Hexateuch are really but parts of an original unit, and that the present Hebrew text, on whose language and style such weighty superstructures are built, is simply a derived text, and cannot be so treated. Surely the time for a "reform in the teaching of the Old Testament" in pulpits and professors' chairs, based on facts generally admitted by critical experts in this department, called for by Canon Cheyne,\* has not yet come. The facts they admit are too few, and they are still too much at variance among themselves to be for others safe or edifying guides.

5. *Effects of the analysis proposed on the matter analyzed and the rest of the Bible.* They are destructive in the extreme. I have already called attention to a surprising omission of what pertains to the supernatural origin of the Bible. But besides this, in order to prepare a way for itself, it is compelled to cut right and left, and to sacrifice not a few of the fundamental conceptions of biblical theology. A single example will suffice to show this. The second and third chapters of Genesis have been justly called the most weighty, theologically, of any in the Old Testament. How rich and important is their teaching has been recently shown anew by Dr. Harris in the *New Englander*.† The new theory makes trash of the larger portion of them. In arguing for their origin as different from that of chapter 1, it is maintained that their author had a radically different and discrepant view of the creation of the world and of man; of the latter's relation to God and the universe; his sin and punishment, etc. This writer, moreover, unlike the other, was not a strict monotheist, and does not represent God as really infinite. Man is put nearly on a level with him. It is an open question, indeed, whether in his excessive anthropomorphisms the writer does not mean to represent in one place that for "climatic reasons" Jehovah takes a walk in the "cool of the day." He places historic facts, too, topsy-turvy, representing that the name "Jehovah," the rites of sacrifice, etc., were primitive, when, as matter of fact, and as the other writer records, they began with Moses, etc.‡ Now, giving the matter treatment of this sort, if it argue little respect or reverence on the part of the critic, is sure to produce less in the ordinary reader. But leaving out of view at present all other results, what is to be said of a theory of the composition of the Bible which makes such fatal havoc with the material which it was set to organize and explain? §

6. *The failure of its chief supports under adequate tests.* The readers of THE HOMILETIC REVIEW who desire to see how the arguments usually urged in favor of this theory are met in detail, at once with the utmost candor and clearness and with the most decisive results, should consult the series

\* *Contemporary Review*, August, 1889.

† February, 1890.

‡ Cf. Harper, in *Hebraica* (October, 1888), pp. 24-31.

§ A contemporary, while predicting the speedy overthrow of this style of criticism, still asks: "But who will make good the harm that it has done?"—Zahn, in *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, May 29th.

of papers now appearing in *Hebraica*\* from the pen of Professor Green, of Princeton. A book has also recently appeared in Germany† which successfully uses against it the *reductio ad absurdum*. It is a learned and richly humorous production. Employing the precise arguments of our critics in the Pentateuch, it shows, by parity of reasoning, that the Epistle to the Romans is divisible into separate documents, each document having a style peculiar to itself and representing a writer who worked independently of the others.

But without entering further into particulars, it is entirely safe to join Principal Cave in his assertion that the "Development Theory of the authorship of the Pentateuch is non-proven. However elaborate the theory be, it is still hypothesis. The tradition of the Church of Christ upon the Book of the Law of Moses is unshaken." In the same connection this author challenges the English adherents of the new theory to clearly indicate, without appealing to the higher critics of the continent, for the benefit of English readers who are not themselves experts: (1) the *anachronisms*, (2) the *contradictions*, (3) the *unhistorical parts* of the Pentateuch on which the theory of composite authorship is based, as well as (4) the *interpretation* they put on the constantly recurring words "Jehovah said," etc., and (5) their *grounds for disbelief in the journal theory* of authorship. No doubt he would readily admit American scholars to the competition.‡

## II.—THE HOMILETICAL VALUE OF CHURCH HISTORY.

By REV. ROBERT C. HALLOCK, PH.D., SOUTHAMPTON, L. I.

THE search after sermon material has become peculiarly intense in these last days. Many run to and fro, and knowledge is increased; and the preacher who seeks to find out acceptable words seems forced to run both faster and farther abroad than of yore. Yet the search is a worthy one. Godliest and ablest ministers pursue it most diligently; the greatest preachers grapple most persistently with the question, where to obtain sermon material. Indeed, it is not the weak brother, of small resources, who feels most deeply the weight of the problem, but rather the eager, active mind; not the men who are content with poor sermons, but the men who have been smitten with a passion for good ones.

In a certain London book-store is a heap of printed MSS., in external appearance like to written sermons; and there many a young curate, who can intone beautifully, but who cannot put together a discourse worth the hearing, obtains his yearly supply of sermons at the fixed and moderate rate of a shilling apiece! For him the question, where sermon material

\* Since January, 1889.

† "Der Römmerbrief beurtheilt und geviertheilt" (also in English dress from T. & T. Clark, Edinb.) Erlangen and Leipzig, 1891.

‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 58, 59.



is to be found, has obtained an all-sufficient answer. But the live preacher is not on the search for dead discourses. The question which haunts him is, where he can get, not cut-and-dried sermons, but sermon material.

The purpose of this paper is to invite attention to a vast store of sermon material that has hitherto been drawn upon to an extent that must be regarded as strangely small, when compared with the richness of the mine. In Church history the preacher will find a mass of virgin gold which can be coined into sermons. All is not gold that glitters, and much of the glittering stuff collected for sermonic use from the current novel, the latest scientific discussion, or the present political issues is spurious; but the sermon material found in Church history is true gold, not a glittering imitation.

I. Church history is a legitimate source of sermon material.

The Bible justifies its use; for the Bible itself, the preacher's text-book, is chiefly history. The historical method is the Divine method of teaching. The history of Israel is a grand sermon in action, and by it the Church has been instructed for thirty centuries. The story of the Man Christ Jesus, the simple narrative of His life and death, embodies the Gospel, and from the beginning has been the power of the Church. The history of the Apostolic Church has moulded organic ecclesiastical life until the present day. The teaching value and authority of biblical history are not questioned.

But is the preacher limited to the use of Bible history? Must the life story of the Church, from the death of John, be relegated to the domain of "profane history"? No; Church history is "sacred history," whether the period be indicated by the letters A.D. or B.C. The history of the Church, from the protevangelium until this present, is an unbroken whole. The Old Testament merges into the New, and finds therein its culmination; the New Testament finds its interpretation in the after centuries of the Church's life. Christ's promise to be with His Church and to guide her into truth was never revoked. At Nicæa, at Westminster, the Lord as truly, though not as visibly, was present as at Sinai; the Reformation was as manifestly the work of God as was the Exodus from Egypt; the marvellous missionary activities of the present age are as sure indications of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit as were the fiery tongues of Pentecost.

The history of the Christian Church is no less a legitimate and necessary extension of the field of the preacher than is the doctrinal system of his Church. No man can or ought to preach "the Bible only," independent of the historic development of doctrine. The preaching of the Bible is inevitably, and rightly, the preaching of a Bible historically interpreted. Doctrine is an expansion—a legitimate and necessary expansion, but nevertheless an expansion—of the Bible. In like manner Church history is an historically expanded Bible, a living commentary upon the Book. It would be illogical, as well as irreligious, to find God in the Book, and

shut Him out of the life. Hence, though the record be not inspired, the history of these nineteen Christian centuries, no less than the history of the Jewish Church, is legitimate sermon material.

II. What are some of its homiletical treasures ?

(1) Church history is exceedingly rich in illustrative material.

It needs no argument to prove the vast value to the preacher of choice and abundant sermon illustrations. To arouse interest, to hold attention, to fix points, nothing can take their place. But every public speaker knows, too, how rare are genuine and usable illustrations. In the preparation of sermons it requires no less industry and originality to work out and polish the illustrations, than it does to prepare and marshal the arguments. To be sure, there are many and large encyclopedias of homiletic illustrations which one may have for a few dollars ; but the preacher who uses them dependently will find himself intellectually in the condition of the men who own land in a certain State—"the more they have of it, the poorer they are!" For the preacher can no more use second-hand illustrations and escape intellectual deterioration, than he can use second-hand sermons and escape moral deterioration. Few, be it admitted, of either illustrations or arguments can be absolutely original ; originality is shown rather in the way they are handled. The difference between a skilful and an unskilful slinger is not that the former creates the stones which he hurls, and the latter does not ; but that the former is more expert in the choice and use of existing stones. Nevertheless, with illustrations as with sermons, that which the live preacher wants is not cut-and-dried illustrations, but illustrative material. And where is this obtainable ? In the Bible first, where alone ideally perfect sermon illustrations are to be found. After that in nature, which is a vast treasure-house of homiletic illustrations. Next to these, the richest store is to be found in Church history. The early ages of persecutions, the Church in the Catacombs, the Nicene Council, Constantine and the Christianization of the Empire, the Monastic System, the Crusades, the Revival of Learning, the Reformation, not to speak of later events, present a store of illustrative material that is surprising in its richness and abundance.

(2) Church history is an effective instrument of doctrinal instruction.

We need not urge that the preacher himself cannot be a master of doctrine except he be thoroughly versed in Church history. What statesman would dare to expound the constitution of his country if uninformed concerning the history of the origin and adoption of that constitution ? A constitution or a creed is a product of history, and is interpretable only in the light of history. Misapprehension of constitution or of creed ordinarily arises from either ignorance or ignoring of history. We are fallen upon days—we will not say, with Milton, "on evil days, and evil men!"—yet on days when it behooves every presbyter to be a Church historian ; for never is a profound knowledge of Church history so imperatively demanded, nor a clear conception of the doctrinal significance of

that history so indispensable, as in periods of confessional readjustment. Church history must mean more than instruction, more even than defence against error; it must mean continuity of life. The humorist jested of one whose "future was behind him," but in no jest the vital elements of the Church's future must be found in her past. The creed of to-morrow must be in living relation to the creed of yesterday. Development there may and will be; cataclysm there must not be! And against cataclysm history is the best defence.

It pertains more to our present subject, however, to say that Church history is an excellent menstruum in which to administer doctrine to the people. Christ dissolved doctrine in parable, but He alone knew the secret of that wondrous alembic. Our best doctrinal solvent is history. And let it be noted once more that the historical method is the Divine method of teaching. The Bible is simply doctrine dissolved in history. Rightly has it been considered a fine saying that "history is philosophy teaching by example;" but it is both finer and truer to say that history, especially Church history, is God teaching by example! The things which befell the men of former times "happened unto them for ensamples, and they were written for our admonition." God teaches humanity in the school of history, and so instructs us to use history in teaching. Indeed, no medium of doctrinal instruction has yet been found that seems in all respects more worthy of the attention of the preacher than Church history. It is interesting to the people. "Tell us a story," is a request that comes not alone from childish lips; and the interest of the story sweetens the otherwise unpalatable moral. Food unenjoyed is seldom well digested. Possibly archangels and German professors prefer undiluted theological pabulum, but all weaker creatures need some doctrinal solvent in order to perfect digestive assimilation. Such doctrinal solvent will be found in Church history. That you must interest people before you can instruct them is truismatic. Church history, by arousing the pleased attention and interest of the audience, will win acceptance for the doctrines which are the implicates of that history.

Furthermore, Church history is effective for doctrinal instruction because it presents doctrine in the concrete instead of the abstract; and the human mind receives and comprehends the concrete rather than the abstract. This is the secret of the power of all story-teaching; the reason for the superiority of example over precept; the explanation of the fact that people remember illustrations more readily than they do arguments. The ordinary mind, unaccustomed to sustained abstract thought, must be reached through the concrete. Now, history may be termed concrete doctrine; doctrine, abstract history. Doctrine reveals history *a priori*; history manifests doctrine *a posteriori*. Given the doctrine, the history must inevitably follow. If, for instance, the doctrine of the love of God for man be true, the history of the Incarnation, with all its antecedents and consequents, must be inexorably necessary from the foundation of

the world." But the human heart would fain embrace the objective, the concrete ; it longs for that which the eyes may see and the hands may handle of the Word of Life. The historic Christ is the revealed, declared, manifested love of God, and that Christ is preached to men's souls. But the theologic Christ, though eternally necessary and ineffably certain, does not command the heart and life. Love must be incarnated ; God must be made visible, tangible ; doctrine must take some objective, concrete form. These are concessions, but Divine concessions, to human weakness ; and the need for them is the vindication of the use of Church history as a medium of doctrinal instruction.

(3) Church history is rich in eloquent themes.

Israel's history was the never-failing source of Israel's eloquence. "What hath God wrought," was its ever-exalted theme. But are the annals of the Christian Church bare of God-given triumphs, Divine leadings, wonderful deliverances by "the mighty hand and stretched-out arm" of the Lord? Had the Jews more cause to cry "Laus Deo!" than have we? Count over the great events in the history of Israel ; they are all paralleled in the history of the Christian Church. Israel's deliverance at the Red Sea was a wonderful one ; but it was not more wonderful, nor more manifestly the work of the Lord, than was the deliverance of the early Church from the persecuting Jews and the heathen hosts of Rome. The waves of the great sea in front, lifting up their mighty forms to bar the advance of Israel ; the pursuing Egyptians in the rear, shouting their rage and hate ; the impassable mountains beside forbidding flight or escape—these did not seem more certainly to portend Israel's destruction than did the terrible enemies arrayed against the Church of the first three centuries. But God was in the midst of His people as of old ; He had chosen Constantine as well as Moses ; and the song of triumph which Israël sang,

" Sound the loud trumpet o'er Egypt's dark sea ;  
Jehovah hath triumphed ! His people are free,"

was joyously echoed by the Church in the year 312 A. D. The pillar of fire and cloud by which God guided Israel through the wilderness was a glorious manifestation of Jehovah, yet not half so glorious as was He, the great Antitype of that pillar, whose flesh was the "cloud" and whose Divinity was the "fire" filling the cloud with glory, and who led the Church of the New Dispensation through deserts more dreadful than those of the forty years' wanderings.

Or shall we instance the bringing in of Israel into the Promised Land—a land flowing with milk and honey? But the Christian Church has entered into many inheritances fairer than was Canaan. God has given to her the nations—Rome, France, Germany, England, America, and still on until she shall possess India, and Africa, and the isles of the sea ! This is the inheritance which God has prepared for His new Israel.

Grand as was the story of Israel of old, grander still is the story of the Church of Christ ; and if the heart of the Israelite thrilled with the story of his nation's past, and found in the recital of that story the deep springs of eloquence, shall not the Christian preacher find in the grander and more wonderful life-story of the Church the source of a yet more majestic eloquence ? If the secular orator finds inspiring themes in the bravery of warriors, the splendors of conquest, or the triumphs of statecraft, shall not the sacred orator find yet loftier themes in the heroism of martyrs, confessors, and missionaries ? No triumphs of the sword have been so glorious as the triumphs of the Cross ; no heroism of warriors has been so sublime as the heroism of that " noble army of martyrs " of whom the world was not worthy. No nation has made such marvellous progress as has the Church of Christ, nor has done so much for the world, nor has stood so unshakenly, nor gives promise of so glorious a future.

" Oh, where are kings and empires now,  
Of old that went and came ?  
But, Lord ! Thy Church is praying yet,  
A thousand years the same."

To the true orator the finding of an inspiring theme is like the discovery of hidden gold, and he who in the love of the Church studies her history will find that history rich even unto affluence in themes that are in the truest and highest sense eloquent.

(4) Church history is an efficient means of Church loyalty.

The nation is wiser in this matter than the Church, for, recognizing the fact that history is the mother of patriotism, national history is taught in all the public schools of the land ; but young Christians are not supposed to know or care anything about the history of their Church. How can we expect our young people to have enthusiastic loyalty for the Church if we do not teach them to be proud of her history ? and how can they be proud of that history if they are not familiar with it ? History is the mother of ecclesiastical as well as political patriotism, and in an age of increasing indifference of spirit toward the Church the preacher cannot afford to neglect this very potent influence for the arousing of Church loyalty.

And once more let it be urged that to use Church history as a stimulus of loyalty is God's own plan, as is evidenced by His dealing with the Jews. Great things He did for Israel, and then He taught them never to let the memory of those mighty deeds depart from their minds unto all generations. Memorial feasts were established ; memorial statutes were enacted ; the children were commanded to be carefully instructed in Church history ; and the marvellous things which God had done in the field of Zoan, and in the wilderness, and in Canaan, were to be household stories for all time to come. And the lesson was well learned. No other nation has had so common knowledge of national history, so ever-present

and influential memory of the nation's past. As a result the Jews were intensely, even fanatically patriotic, and God's purpose—the preservation of the chosen people as the depository of the true religion until Messiah—was attained. Thus God used Church history as a most effective agent of loyalty in the ancient Church; no doubt the same agent will be found efficient in the Church of to-day.

(5) It remains to say that the use of Church history for sermon material is profitable to the preacher himself. By it his enthusiasm is aroused, his faith is strengthened, and his mental horizon is widened. He sees the ages in their relation; realizes both the continuity and the development of the Church's life; perceives that from Paradise lost unto Paradise regained the Church, though externally multiform, is essentially one, and though retaining her identity, is evermore advancing. The true Church historian is never a sectary; wide his horizon, wide his charity. He feels himself a member of the Church universal; with Israel, he has part in Abraham; Paul and Peter are alike his teachers; Athanasius, Augustine, Luther, and Calvin are all his brethren; every denomination that truly worships Christ is a part of his Church. For him the Church's history evidences her unity, and none the less her perpetual progress attests the indwelling of the Spirit of Life. These two words, "unity" and "progress," express to him the two supreme, harmonious laws of the history of the Church; under all diversity he perceives unity; through all history, progress. History does indeed repeat itself, but always on a higher plane. God's work is progressive. "No past ever shone," says the New York Synod's pastoral letter, "with the glory of this present hour. Every last hour is fullest of the glory of Christ. This day in which we live is the best and most radiant one in the world's history. God's events never go backward, they hasten toward the consummation." From the beginning God has wrought an ever-widening work. The profound student of Church history perceives that "through the ages one increasing purpose runs"—a purpose that began in Eden, broadened through all the centuries of Jewish history, was magnified upon Calvary, manifested at Pentecost, has increased until this present, and shall be consummated in that "one supreme, Divine event," to which "the whole creation moves!" The perception of the definite purpose and onward movement of historic development in the Old Testament, until all the lines of type and symbol and ceremony, of prophecy and history, had converged upon Him who, manifested in the fulness of the times, was the fulfilment of all, is perhaps the grandest thought from Old Testament study. But the onward movement of historic development did not cease at Bethlehem, nor at Calvary, nor on Pentecost. That "increasing purpose" still increases through the ages; it "deepens on and up" unto a world-wide Gospel and a world-wide sway of Christ the King. Then cometh the end; Christ proclaimed to all, Redemption completed, the Divine consummation reached, and then the great cry, "Alleluia, for the

Lord God omnipotent reigneth!" On and up to this supreme climax all Church history, even from the protevangelium in forfeited Paradise, has been and is tending. To see this with clearer vision, and then to lead the people to see it likewise, is worth all earnest study in Church history.

This paper aspires to no higher function than that of a finger-post. Some wandering searcher after sermon material may perchance be served by it. The history of the Church of Christ will be found to have much homiletical value. It is rich in illustrative material; it is "profitable for doctrine;" it yields the preacher many altogether eloquent themes; it proves a most effective agent of Church loyalty and enthusiasm; and it is reflexively of great benefit to the preacher himself, stimulating his enthusiasm, strengthening his faith, and broadening his horizon. The more general homiletic use of Church history, it is confidently believed, would prove useful to both people and preacher.

---

### III.—THE RELIGIOUS PAPER AND THE MINISTRY.

BY WILLIAM HAYES WARD, D.D., NEW YORK CITY.

THE ministry is an avocation and religion is its business. To other people religion is not an avocation, but only a sacred privilege. To the minister it is, to be sure, a privilege also, but it is also an avocation; it is the business out of which he gets a living and to which he gives all the time which other men give to profitable secular labor. If other Christian men need a religious paper which shall inform them as to religious views, and help them in their religious life, much more does the professionally religious man need such a paper. If they ought to take one or more such papers, much more he. It is to him what a trade journal is to an artisan or a manufacturer.

One does not need nowadays to say that a minister must take a religious journal. The temptation is to take more than he can read. He cannot live without his own denominational paper, he must have it, and then he will want the more leisurely discussions to be found in his denominational monthly or quarterly. But this will not satisfy him. In this day, when Young Men's Christian Associations, Societies of Christian Endeavor, and Sunday-school Conventions have broken down the wall between the denominations, he will find that he cannot get along without some one of those weeklies which are devoted to the news and the questions that affect the Church universal, and one or more of those monthlies which appeal to the student of religious philosophy or method, and which are devoted to his own professional specialties. The minister in a large denomination will hardly find one denominational paper enough. He must take at least two in order to know what is going on in his communion. And then it will be strange if he does not feel the need of broadening his outlook on

other Christian bodies, and the necessary result is that he will take one or more journals of other denominations, or some paper that attempts to be a weekly encyclopædia of all denominations. By this time he begins to ask himself how he can read the pile of papers that cover his study table, and overlay his books of theology, and perhaps his commentaries or even his Bible.

Nevertheless this is an evil he must risk. He must somehow manage to hit the golden mean between too many papers and too few, with the likelihood of erring on the side of too many, or rather, on the side of giving too much time to those which he takes.

As I have said, a minister must take his denominational paper, and that paper, if he takes but one, the one which most fully represents the section in which he lives. He has, therefore, the right, as one of those represented, to make certain demands on his paper. It asks his patronage because it represents his body, or his section, of churches. He has, therefore, the right to demand that it shall faithfully and fully represent them. It must give him the news of those churches, otherwise he is defrauded—that is, its first function is to give the news, the religious gossip, if you please, of those churches. This is its first duty, and he has a right to complain if it is not done. The editor may say, "How can I give the news of all these churches, if nobody takes pains to send it to me?" That is no defence; it is his business to see to it that somehow he gets it, and his readers get it. We have nothing to do with that side of it now, except to say that the solicitations of the editor that ministers send him items of news affecting their churches should be religiously attended to. Ministers or church clerks, and especially ministers, do not advertise their churches half enough. This is no age of bushels; it asks for candlesticks; and a candlestick not well lighted will be taken out of its place. Whatever happens in the church—the settlement or removal of a pastor, the building or repairing of a church or chapel, the reception of five members—any matter that interests the church should be sent, without elaboration or glorification, preferably on a postal-card, to the denominational paper. There is no vanity about that; it is only duty, a kindness to all one's neighbors, who all presumably want to know the family news. It is no more censurable than writing a family letter to absent brothers and sisters, who have a right to this much advertisement of family affairs.

The minister has the right also to demand of his religious paper, whether denominational or general, that it shall provide him with abundant means to form his own conclusions on all important questions, religious or ecclesiastical, that come before him as a teacher of religion. That means that his paper must, above all things, not exclude discussions on matters discussed in his denomination. The paper is not intended to suppress but to promote discussion, with the understanding that the truth will gain thereby, and that Truth is no Eastern baby that must be bound so tightly that she cannot brush off a fly, but is a sturdy youth whom much exercise and



some buffeting will not injure. On the other hand, it is the paper's privilege and duty, having given both sides a fair show, to take every positive ground itself, and make itself an intellectual power in all public affairs. Journalistically—mind, I say journalistically—it is more important to be positive than it is to be right, for it is a paper's business to make its influence felt. But this must not affect the paper's duty to give both sides of any legitimate religious discussion a fair show. It is doubtful if a minister has any other duty to an unfair, partisan paper, than to let it alone. Yet in its editorial pages the individuality of the paper must show itself. It is the editorial page that gives opinions and tries to exert influence; the rest of the paper informs. The editorial page should express decided opinions; and it is with a paper as with a man—that is, the strongest and ablest which can show well-grounded, well-defended, positive opinions on the largest number of current topics.

It is a pastor's duty to see to it that as many families in his congregation as possible take a religious paper, and preferably, as a general thing, their denominational paper. I believe those denominations are wise which expect their pastors to present regularly the claims of their papers to their people. The undenominational papers must generally look out for themselves; they must present their own attractions, even if they should happen to compare favorably in enterprise and ability with the organ of the denomination.

The editor of a religious paper is almost always a minister, though its owner by no means so generally a minister. This being the case, the editor is very likely to make the mistake of editing the paper chiefly for ministers. He understands them better than he does the laymen, and is most concerned with their interests and discussions. He will probably try to interest them more than any one else; and, if he be a somewhat strong man, and if his natural conceit is somewhat flattered by the deference which everybody, with no good reason, pays to the editor, he will very likely come to think that he has been ordained to set right all the errors of his brethren. In this he is not wholly mistaken; for, a very fallible man as he is, even with all the help he gets from his associates, it is his duty to express his views clearly on every controverted point, and to make his influence felt through his paper in every legitimate way. But there is a serious danger of his setting up as a dictator, and of his being listened to by a large part of his readers with a certain subserviency, as if his editorial impersonality carried a weight of authority which his personal utterance as a private minister could never command. Now it is by no means sure, and not overwhelmingly probable, that in any controverted matter before the churches the editor will be right. If the question be a theological one, and comes along the lines of that progress in religious thinking which is constantly going on, as the Scriptures are more and more carefully studied, then the religious newspaper will probably be on the conservative, which is very likely to be the wrong side. Newspapers are generally

edited by rather old men, who are in serious danger of being behind the thinking of their age. The ministry is composed of men of all ages, with the young men in the majority. It is the views of the progressive and yet devout and believing young men that will prevail in the next generation; but the religious papers are not edited by them. The religious papers, in their thinking, are apt to be behind the seminaries which educate and form the young men. The religious editor very likely does not find time to catch the religious movement of his day, which gets its direction very largely in the ministers' clubs which discuss every subject with great freedom, and which now more, perhaps, than any other agency, are teaching tolerance of diverging views, and are cultivating that historic sense which perceives the current of things, and discovers what is the eddy and what the main course of the stream. I may here express my own profound conviction that the main theological current in this generation is not eschatological—that is an eddy; it concerns the doctrine of Scripture. Congregationalists, in their unnecessary and unhappy discussion during the past six or eight years, involving one of their seminaries and the oldest and most honored foreign missionary society in the country, have been anticipating a discussion for which the Church will not be ready for a generation. It will have to settle its doctrine of Scripture first. That question is what the Presbyterian Church has been discussing, in a mild way, this last half dozen years, and over which it is now suddenly plunged in a hot debate which is likely to put the question of revision of its Standards quite in the shade. Now it is very curious to observe how this question, which resolves itself, in its simplest form, to the question whether Divine inspiration excludes all human error, is treated by the press. I suppose the bulk of the younger scholarship of the Presbyterian Church, as represented by its professors of Old and New Testament interpretation, in about all the seminaries except Princeton, would decline to defend the inerrancy of the Scriptures, and would, with nearly all the Christian world outside of America, accept the general results of the Higher Criticism, as worked out in the Pentateuch and Isaiah. But the Presbyterian newspapers are far behind the seminaries and the ministry in this matter. There is not one of them that maintains the generally accepted results of Christian scholarship on this subject. One or two of them are tolerant toward the exponents of these views, but the majority of them are positively and vigorously opposed, and most of them have urged that the leader in these views should be removed from his professorial chair by the General Assembly. The Southern Presbyterian Church is now in a similar attitude on evolution. It has always been so in the past. The same thing was true in the late discussion over a question not of eschatology, but of tolerance, among the Congregationalists. The religious papers were almost unanimously against tolerance even up to the time when the ministry was ready to decide in favor of liberty of views and of teaching. When the decision came last October the denominational

press, even after the change of front of its leading representative, was yet far behind the ministers. What is true of these two denominations is true of all others. As a matter of course their newspapers will move slower than the people. Lay representation among the Methodists could not find expression in the Methodist papers, and had to establish new papers through which it could speak, just as fifty years ago New School Presbyterianism had to create a new press for itself.

These facts illustrate what I have to say, that the somewhat natural tendency of a religious paper not merely to argue, but to dictate and exclude, is one against which the ministers should be on their guard. On the debated denominational questions there is no special presumption that the newspaper will be right. If it is a matter involved in that progress of theology which it is to be hoped will always be going on, and which must be going on if we reverently search the Scriptures, the presumption in fact is that the paper, edited by old men, will be on the conservative side, and therefore probably wrong. In this presumption theology does not differ from science. The elder Agassiz would never accept Evolution, even after his own son and all the other young biologists had adopted it. While our religious papers will be naturally conservative, our ministers have the right to hold their papers to a strict account and resent any dictation, and even more any lack of fairness to both parties in all those discussions which occupy the attention of ministers and churches.

Nevertheless we will all respect a dictatorial paper more than a weak or flabby one. The latter has no reason for existence. A strong, kindly, generous, positive paper, which puts its views strongly yet with tolerance, which has opinions and is not afraid to express them, becomes the mentor and guide not of the layman alone, but of the ministers also. Its influence and usefulness are beyond all telling. Its loyal constituents honor and love it, and on their support it rests.

---

#### IV.—ON WHAT LINE MAY ALL THE ENEMIES OF THE SALOON UNITEDLY DO BATTLE?—A SYMPOSIUM.

BY EDWARD EVERETT HALE, D.D., BOSTON, MASS.

THE dogs and the cats of a certain community found that one particular eagle was eating up all the little puppies and all the little kittens. The dogs first established a patrol which kept the eagle off the ground tolerably well, but they could not keep the little puppies from running up on the roofs of sheds, and there the eagle caught them and carried them off. Far less could they take care of the little kittens, who would run up into the apple-trees, where the eagle found them. Then the cats took alarm and they established a patrol in the trees and on the sheds, but they could not make the kittens understand that they must not run down upon the

ground. In fact, the more they told them not to, the more they went there, and the dogs having withdrawn their patrol in discouragement, the eagle ate up kittens and puppies together when he chose.

"In this state of things," as Livy says, they had a council of the dogs and the cats. There was one old dog who had conceived the idea that they might both carry on the patrols at the same time, the cats in the trees and on the sheds, and the dogs on the ground. And he showed, both by statistics and by an appeal to common sense, that, if this were done, the eagle would have to go to parts unknown, or perhaps would starve for want of kittens and puppies to sustain his life upon.

Everybody agreed that this was true, but when the council met it proved that all the dogs were determined that the eagle should be followed into all countries where he should go, and that a war should be waged against all eagles everywhere; and with the exception of the one old dog who had called the council, the dogs entirely refused to have any patrol at all unless the cats would join, with their lives and fortunes and sacred honor, in this general attack on the eagle wherever he should choose to go.

To this the cats could not be made to agree, though one or two of them did not dislike the enterprise. The consequence was that there was no co-operation, and the eagle ate up all the puppies and all the kittens, and, after the old dogs and the old cats had died, there were left neither dogs, cats, kittens nor puppies.

This is what is called a parable. For the benefit of the *New York Observer* it is added that such stories convey a useful moral, but that it is not implied by him who tells them that precisely these facts ever took place in any spot in the world. That is to say, dogs cannot speak, neither can cats speak, and they do not often hold congresses together.

All the same the moral is true. When I was asked to contribute to the symposium proposed by Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls, I was tempted to say in reply that everybody knew well enough what the ground is on which the enemies of the saloon may unite, but that everybody knew also that they would not unite on any ground. Thus far they have preferred to quarrel with each other rather than to unite in any well-considered scheme for the abolition of the saloon.

That is to say, 1. Some people believe that to drink at all of alcoholic liquor is wrong. They believe that he who drinks it commits sin. They believe that he who gives it or sells it to another commits equal sin. These people, having very strong views of their own, wish to prohibit its manufacture and its sale, and speaking in general, they have thus far shown themselves wholly unwilling to co-operate in any way with the people who do not have these convictions.

2. There is also another class of people, about as large as these, so far as I can see, who believe that the saloon as it exists in America is more dangerous to America and to her children than all other evils together. Among them are many men who drink wine and other liquors. But these

same men detest an open bar. They see in the open bar danger to their children, and they see that around it there always gathers a political club of the lowest and basest character, and they are perfectly willing, therefore, to take any measures, even the most stringent, for the abolition of the open bar.

Now, if it were possible for these two sets of people to unite their forces simply for the suppression of the open bar or the abolition of the saloon, the saloon would cease to exist within five years in nine tenths of the American States, perhaps in all of them. But this requires a frank and ready union of all the parties for that single purpose—the suppression of the open bar. That should be their rallying cry, and to attain that end should be their endeavor.

Some years ago I thought it possible that such a union might be effected. It seemed to me possible that as the cavalry and the artillery of the army unite against a certain enemy, the cavalryman not insisting that the artilleryman shall ride upon a horse, and the artilleryman not insisting that the cavalryman shall carry a cannon, it might be that the enemies of the saloon should unite against a common enemy. I am sorry to say that I have found in practice a great disinclination for such union. But I still think that such union is the object which is desirable; I think it represents the policy which angels and archangels ought to adopt in carrying out the will of God. And I venture to suggest it, in the way of the parable with which I began, as a very simple policy. As I have stated, I do so without any great immediate hope that the publishers of the *HOMILETIC REVIEW* will agree with me, or indeed most of the persons who have been invited to contribute to this symposium.

## II.

BY HERRICK JOHNSON, D.D., LL.D., CHICAGO, ILL.

I HAVE been a good deal interested in Dr. Hale's little parable of the dogs and the cats as a partial answer to this question. There are some infelicities of detail that greatly interfere with the naturalness of the story. The attempt to establish a cat patrol "in the apple-trees" to guard the little kittens running up there for play against the swoop of the naughty eagle, and then telling these little pussy-cats they must stay in the trees and never go down upon the ground, if they would keep out of the eagle's claws, is certainly an original conceit, and amusingly illustrative of some modern efforts to protect society from the saloon bird of prey. But, notwithstanding violences done to both cat and dog nature by the setting of the story, the purpose of it is clearly apparent. Cats and dogs must "co-operate" and "carry on their patrols at the same time," if they would keep the kittens and puppies from being eaten up by the eagle.

In Dr. Hale's parable, at the council that was called to consider the difficulty, the dogs insisted that the eagle "should be followed into all countries where he should go, and that a war should be waged against all eagles everywhere." Unless the cats would join in this general attack, the dogs determined they would have no patrol at all. To this the cats could not be made to agree, and as a consequence the eagle ate up all the puppies and all the kittens. Moral: Good people should unite against a common enemy.

To this we all agree. Those were very silly dogs that "entirely refused to have any patrol at all" unless the cats would join in a "general attack on the eagle wherever he should choose to go." And of course the dogs in Dr. Hale's little parable stand for us poor unreasoning Prohibitionists who are forever represented as insisting upon "a whole loaf or no bread." But how easy it is to put dogs at a disadvantage in a parable about dogs and cats, when a cat gets up the parable!

Suppose, now, in the council of cats and dogs called to consider what should be done with the eagle, the following colloquy had been had:

*Cats*: "The eagle is committing dreadful ravages. Ere long, if this is allowed to go on, there will be left neither dogs, cats, kittens nor puppies. Let us unite to stop it."

*Dogs*: "Dreadful ravages, indeed. Let us unite to stop them."

*Cats*: "But we cannot abolish the eagle all at once. Let us unite to abolish him as much as possible."

*Dogs*: "Very well. If we cannot abolish the eagle altogether and all at once, let us unite to abolish him as much as possible."

*Cats*: "Seeing, then, that we have not patrol cats and dogs enough for all the trees and sheds and all our grounds, we propose that we unite in allowing the eagle certain days and districts when and where he can go on eating up kittens and puppies, he being rigidly prohibited from all other days and all other districts, and it being provided that the eagle shall pay for this privilege a good round sum, that will help us care for the kittens and puppies he has injured but has not killed!"

*Dogs*: "But how can we ever look an honest animal in the face, if once an eagle is seen in one of these license districts eating up somebody's kittens and puppies, with this bold device upon his breast: 'Authorized by the Council of Cats and Dogs!'"

There was one old cat who at once saw the situation, and he said: "That will never do. We cats should have a conscience. We can't discriminate between kittens. If the eagle is going to eat some kittens any way, we must wash our paws clean of the business of giving him the privilege. Let us unite with the dogs in fighting the eagle to the death, and if he gets any kittens and puppies, it won't be because in certain districts we gave him the liberty to try."

But this appeal to conscience seemed to have no weight with the feline side of the house. So there was no co-operation; the eagle was given

the freedom of certain districts, and he went on eating up the puppies and the little pussy-cats, wearing upon his breast the bold device : " Authorized by the Grand Council of the Cats."

I submit that the dogs are not quite so silly now as they were when Dr. Hale told the story. And I further submit that the revised parable points out " on what line all the enemies of the saloon may unitedly do battle."

Let us first understand each other's exact position. Dr. Hale divides the opponents of the saloon into two classes : First, those who hold that all drinking of alcoholic liquor for beverage purposes is a sin, and would therefore totally prohibit both the manufacture and sale of it for such purposes ; and, second, those who detest the open bar and count it a menace to society and a source of the basest influences, although they do not regard a moderate indulgence in spirituous liquors as wrong ; many of this class themselves drinking wine and other liquors. But they are perfectly willing to take any measures, even the most stringent, for the abolition of the open bar.

Undoubtedly by the first class is meant the " Prohibitionists," distinctly so called. But Dr. Hale fails here, as in the parable, to represent their true position. They advocate the prohibition of the saloon because it is an unredeemable nuisance, and not because the drinking of a glass of wine or other liquors is a sin. They want it legally abolished because it is a waste of values, a breeder of lust, a hot-bed of iniquity, and a constant menace to peace and good order. And they include in the legal prohibition all manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, because they believe that is the straightest, surest, and most effective road to the abolition of the saloon itself, on the principle that stopping the fountain is the way to-stop the streams.

We have no doubt Dr. Hale has properly described the second class of people to which he refers. And he ventures the prophecy that " if it were possible for these two sets of people to unite their forces, simply for the suppression of the open bar, or the abolition of the saloon, the saloon would cease to exist within five years in nine tenths of the American States, perhaps in all of them."

Without claiming any representative capacity or official authorization, I am frank to say the great body of Prohibitionists are ready for such a union for such a purpose. " The suppression of the open bar" ought to band together all good men who detest its influence and deplore its awful ravages. We Prohibitionists believe that to prohibit all manufacture and all sale of liquor for drinking purposes is the best way to suppress the saloon. And we still argue and labor for the abolition of the brewery and the distillery. But we are ready, the great body of us, to join hands in a party organization simply for the abolition of the saloon.

To accomplish this specific object, we propose that the party of the first part drop, for the present, insistence on the prohibition of all manufacture and sale of liquor for beverage uses, and aim solely at the annihilation of

the saloon. The movement must be Prohibition, pure and simple—the utter abolition of the open bar.

This means, of course, a war of extermination on our present license system—the sweeping of this entire legislation off the statute books. It means the prohibition of the saloon, as far and as fast as we can get it, and nothing else. It means the union of all parties for this single purpose, and no other. It means, if we can keep a saloon five hundred feet from a school-house, we will do that; if we can extend the prohibition to a thousand feet, we will do that; if to a ward or a county or a city or a State, we will do that. We will capture as much territory for Prohibition as possible, narrowing the area of the saloon-cursed district everywhere and more and more, until the open bar is utterly exterminated in all the American States. But we will not license a single grog shop, for licensing is not suppressing. Nor will we aim at all manufacture and sale, for this hits sometimes back of the saloon, but we will unitedly strike at the saloon first and last and all the time. And if an open bar exists anywhere, it will exist because we cannot annihilate it and not because we have licensed it. Thus the conscientious scruples of the one class in regard to liberty will be respected, and the conscientious scruples of the other class in regard to license will be respected.

Is not this a line on which all the enemies of the saloon may unitedly do battle? Does it not dispose of all questions of casuistry, and set us determinedly against one of the mightiest evils of our day? Will Drs. Hale and Abbott and such like men, who have no sympathy with the saloon, but who detest and hate it, join us in this issue against it?

---

#### V.—SCRIPTURE INTERPRETATION.

BY JAMES MUDGE, D.D., CLINTON, MASS.

No inquiry is more practical or important than that which seeks to settle the true place of Holy Scripture—its composition, its exposition, its authority. Until this shall be settled almost everything else is more or less unsettled; for there are few matters of private duty, public policy, or Christian doctrine that are not in a greater or less degree affected by this discussion, that do not make their appeal sooner or later to Bible texts.

What that true place may be is a question not to be lightly answered. The old traditional view, which prevailed in the last century and the previous one, according to which we must maintain the equal inspiration, verbal dictation, and absolute infallibility of all parts of the Bible, a single error of any kind, grammatical, historical, rhetorical, scientific or otherwise being accounted sufficient to overthrow the whole structure of Christianity—this view, we say, though it undoubtedly has yet some influence



on current opinion, is now thoroughly repugnant to the vast majority of thoughtful minds. It has been overthrown by the facts which have been brought out in the various realms of modern investigation.

But in place of this now discredited doctrine no altogether satisfactory and wholly self-consistent theory has arisen. We are still somewhat at sea, in a transition period, searching for the best position to take. A theory is required that will free us from the necessity of doing violence to any facts, whether established by physical science in the world of matter, or by historical criticism in the world of letters; a theory that will enable us heartily to welcome all truth of every conceivable sort; that will conserve in the wisest way all that is really essential for our highest spiritual good, while affording abundant scope for the freest work of the intellect; in a word, that will not prevent us from being both devout and scholarly at the same time. Such a theory will settle the true place of the Bible; will decide how far it is the work and word of God, how far the work and word of man; will define inspiration; will face the problem of the canon; will take into consideration without alarm the composite authorship of the Hexateuch, the peculiar formation of the Gospels, the free way in which the New Testament writers quote from the Old Testament, and the individual peculiarities of style so noticeable in different biblical authors; will note the corruptions which divine wisdom has permitted to creep into the text from the errors of transcribers and translators, and will give some account of the Holy Spirit's part in producing and preserving and explaining the Holy Book.

Without at all attempting the full elaboration of this very desirable theory, we shall endeavor in the present essay to formulate a few practical rules of Scripture interpretation. In the construction of these rules, no doubt, the leading features of a theory of Scripture will emerge, but we prefer to approach the matter from the practical rather than the theoretical side.

*RULE I.—The plain literal meaning of any passage as determined by grammar and lexicon has the first presumption in its favor.* In other words, the Bible is literature—a part of the great body of literature of the world, though having some features peculiar to itself—and hence is to be interpreted by the common laws of language, like all other books. We are not to look for recondite, hidden meanings which the words in their simple, natural sense do not convey. The primary question should be, Is the sense which has been put upon this passage grammatically allowable? If not, we have no business to indulge or accept it. Grammar and lexicon must rule, not creed or dogma or custom or prejudice or fancy or fanaticism. Any departure from this rule opens the door to unending perversions and the wildest flights of imagination; to allegories and fantasies innumerable. It is by ignoring this rule that Second Adventists have been able to force the Bible to seem to give them countenance. When Scripture has said “quickly,” “immediately,” “near at hand,”

they have insisted that it meant in the far future, thousands of years away. This is to play havoc with common sense. As Dr. Owen well says, "If the Scripture has more than one meaning, it has no meaning at all." It may be made to mean anything or nothing, according to the whim of the seeker. Figurative, poetic language is, of course, to be understood according to the rules of poetry. But it cannot as poetry have two or three meanings, still less can it be both prose and poetry at the same time.

This, then, is the first thing in understanding Scripture: patient study of words and clauses, roots and branches, particles and tenses, to get the one simple meaning that lies generally on or near the surface of the sentence, or, if it does not, must be discovered in the same way that the meaning of a sentence in Cicero or Plato is discovered. Words should be understood in their literal sense, unless such literal interpretation involves a manifest absurdity. This rule commends itself now to almost all as perfectly right and reasonable. All whose opinions are worth heeding are agreed that linguistic study and philology are fundamental in this matter, that the languages in which the Bible was written must be mastered before any solid progress can be made. Yet it is a position of comparatively modern adoption, has been largely or totally ignored through most of the centuries, and is still quite often ruthlessly violated.

RULE II.—*The Bible must be understood in accordance with the times in which it was written and first read or heard.* Next in importance to the grammatical exegesis, which lies at the foundation, we put the historical. In other words, we must inquire, in the second place, what modification of the plain natural meaning, as it would appear to us, is demanded by the historical position and surroundings of the author. For the biblical writers, while in some respects above their times, were in most respects men *of* their times, and hence affected by the circumstances about them. We must put ourselves so far as historical research will admit into their places, and from that point of view try to ascertain what meaning should be given to their words. Each book has a scenery of its own which we must do our utmost to reproduce. This has very often been entirely ignored. The Bible has been read as though it were written in America in the nineteenth century, and hence it has been interpreted after American models. Meanings have been imposed upon it, or read into it, which could not possibly have been in the mind of the original writer, because of the time in which and the place from which he wrote. The true interpretation, it is evident, must express everything which the author intended, and introduce nothing which he did not intend. That meaning is to be preferred which best harmonizes with the character of the person speaking and with his other utterances. No one should be interpreted so as to make him out a fool, if it can possibly be helped.

These two rules taken together make up what is called the grammatico-historical method, now very generally accepted as the only true basis of

sound exegesis, that which makes the laws of grammar and the facts of history the chief guide to the meaning. It was introduced into the United States about fifty years ago, chiefly by Moses Stuart of Andover, who followed Ernesti, translating and editing his principles of interpretation, first published in 1761.

RULE III.—*Next to grammar and history, in their influence upon exegesis, come rhetoric and logic.* Their laws must be regarded, their principles taken carefully into account. It is well known that there is a vast variety of figures of speech in the Bible, just as in all other books. Metaphor, simile, metonymy, synecdoche, apostrophe, personification, interrogation, irony, and hyperbole are frequently employed. There are fables, riddles, enigmas, parables, allegories, proverbs, types and symbols in almost all parts of the Book. These different sorts of language must be carefully discriminated. He who, in the Gradgrind method, takes everything as if it were the baldest, prosiest statement of literal fact, after the manner of a law-book, simply makes nonsense of the word. The rhetorical features of the Bible have been too greatly overlooked. Many have appeared to think it a kind of irreverence to admit that these things were there, and that the ordinary rules of literary composition had been followed in the sacred writings. They have formed an *a priori* conception of what such a book as the Bible ought to be and must be, or what they would have made it if they had had the arranging of the matter, instead of searching closely to see what it actually is. The irreverence is really with them in thus setting up their personal standard and trying to make the facts conform thereto. Since rhetoric in abundance is here, there can be no true interpretation which does not strictly regard it.

But while too little attention has been paid to the rhetoric of the Bible and too little heed has been given to its grammar, there has been too much logic thrust upon it—that is, logic of the modern, occidental sort. There is very little formal, technical, scholastic logic in the Bible. Eastern rather than Western modes of reasoning prevail. The forms of thought to which the minds of that age were accustomed and which they would understand are used. The Hebrew mind worked somewhat differently from the Anglo-Saxon. Hence the strict severe logical analysis familiar to our Western mind in these modern times, when applied to the Bible often leads astray. It is this method which has produced a great number of proof texts that are made to prove things that were never in the mind of the Bible writer; and these proof texts have been in very many instances drawn indiscriminately from all parts of the Bible, as though biblical writers were all alike logical, which is, of course, simply absurd.

It has been too much forgotten that the Bible is a book for the common people rather than for the scholar—that is, while needing some scholarship for its proper interpretation now, it was written for the common people of that ancient time; its language is popular, not philosophical or scientific; it is not a body of divinity or a mathematical treatise; it was composed

by men taken for the most part from the multitude ; it was addressed to all, on subjects interesting to all, intended to be understood by all, provided they had moral sympathy and common sense. Hence its style abounds in inaccuracies and loose expressions, such as must be so considered when severely examined, and such as are always found in discourses meant for the masses. On this account it happens that the plain unsophisticated reader even in our own day quite often gets at the truth of a passage, while the learned student, in his painful search for something very deep and hidden, wholly overshoots the mark, and entirely fails to apprehend the simple purpose of the author. The Bible is for the many, not for the few, and too much stress has been put upon the letter, too much dependence given to logic, where a freer, looser, simpler, and more spiritual method would have furnished more truth.

RULE IV.—*No single expression of Scripture is to be taken by itself alone, but only in connection with the whole body of the Book, and more especially of its immediate context.* This may be termed the comparative exegesis, and should have a place next after the grammatical, the historical, and the rhetorical. The meaning of words will be modified necessarily by the relation in which they stand, by the general scope and plan of the author's work, and by the line of thought which he is pursuing. There can also almost always be found kindred passages in other parts of the volume where the sense will be more clearly given, thus enabling us more keenly to distinguish the true from the false. The rule is that Scripture is to be interpreted by Scripture itself, the less plain by the more plain, the figurative and poetical by the straightforward declarations of prose. It is to be interpreted, as is sometimes said, in accordance with the analogy of faith—that is, in accordance with the substance of doctrine obtained by collating a large number of the plainest precepts. Many a passage that taken alone appears startling, or might be made the basis of dangerous error, when properly modified by the many other passages that also bear upon the theme, is seen to be entirely sensible and to give no occasion for trouble. In a book constructed like the Bible, written by so many different authors not only in different moods, but in so many different ages and countries, there must of necessity be many seeming disagreements and apparent conflicts. Hence harmony must be secured by the adoption of that view which is found to do the least violence all around, texts being not simply counted but weighed, and a general balance struck that will embody the most mature conclusion of judicious minds.

RULE V.—*The main purpose of the entire Book should have great weight in determining the force and value of each separate portion.* This may be regarded as an extension of the last rule, but it is of such great importance and has been so frequently lost sight of as to deserve separate and emphatic mention. What is the purpose of the Bible? It is to make the God of grace and of redemption known to man. Its chief office is to be a witness to the person and work of Christ ; to present to us Jesus as the great

object of Christian faith ; to cause us to know what true Christianity is, what is true for the Christian to think and right for the Christian to do ; to be an authoritative guide in matters of religion, doctrine, and morals ; to direct our worship, faith, and practice ; to enlighten us as to our duties in this world and our destiny in the world to come. As has been well said, " It is to teach us how to go to heaven, not how the heavens go." This being the case, " instruction in righteousness," as Paul says, being the object of the Book, all matters found in it which have no immediate or necessary connection with this object—such as many historical statements, astronomical observations, geological inferences, chronological details, and other *minutiæ* resulting from the imperfect or erroneous physical science of the day—will be treated as unimportant accessories. Errors and discrepancies of fact, date, number, and name, noted in this portion of the contents, should in no way be permitted to shake confidence in the Book where it treats of the one topic in regard to which alone it is appointed to speak *ex cathedra* ; nor need it at all destroy confidence in the general trustworthiness and accuracy and credibility as well as inspiration of the sacred historians. Credibility is to be distinguished from infallibility or inerrancy. Credibility is not destroyed by errors in trivial matters and minute details, that do not affect the author's scope of argument or religious instructions. Such errors may be viewed without concern.

The word of God is contained in the Bible, but the Bible contains many things which are not, strictly speaking, and in the fullest sense, the divine word. By the word of God in this connection we understand all those truths of morals and religion which are essential to reveal the Redeemer. This is in the Book, and this is without error, but infallibility cannot and need not be ascribed to the other things also found in the Book as a component part of its purely human dress. There is perhaps no better definition given of the Bible than that of Professor G. T. Ladd, as follows : " The Bible is the collection of writings, presumably authentic and inspired, which the body of believers in past times have judged to be of authority in teaching the Christian religion, and useful in building up the Christian life." Those things in the Book which have no necessary bearing on the Christian religion and the Christian life the devout and scholarly interpreter may treat with entire freedom, even as he would if they were found in any other highly respected volume.

The Bible, according to this definition, be it noted, is a collection of books rather than one book. This library of pamphlets has indeed a unity which fully justifies their being bound together, a marvellous unity, if the wide diversity of their authorship be considered ; but it is an organic, not an inorganic unity. It is not one, like a rock, of uniform texture throughout, or like a pail of water. It has the unity of the ocean with its myriad waves, of the continent with its multiform features, of the heavens, where one star differeth from another star in glory, and all declare the

wonderful works of God. It is unity with an amazing variety. It is one, like the human body, made up of a great many parts, each part having a different function and a different value. There are parts in the Bible corresponding to the nails and the hair, the teeth, the fingers, the feet. There are also parts corresponding to the lungs, the heart, the brain. To treat all alike, as if all were of equal importance, is absurd. The vital part is Christ. He is the centre of the system, the source of the authority of the Book, and every part takes its rank according to the relation it holds to Him; or if we choose to say that all authority, all power resides in God, then we must add that He has delegated this authority to Christ and His apostles in a different degree from what He has to Moses and the Jewish prophets.

It is well known that the Jews divided the Old Testament into three parts: the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa, ascribing to these parts very different degrees of inspiration, excellence, and authority. It is also well known that seven of the New Testament books did not attain for some centuries complete recognition as canonical, so that a division of the books into those of the first rank and those of the second is entirely proper. It has been suggested that the contents of the New Testament as a whole may be divided into at least three classes. One class would comprise those fundamental doctrines and facts which are plainly taught as necessary elements of the truth of Christ. Another class would comprise many statements about facts of a historical, archaeological, scientific, or purely private sort, clearly not affecting the truthfulness of the facts and doctrines of the first class. A third class would comprise whatsoever lay between the first and second, and hence was of a somewhat doubtful nature. One writer of the sixth century proposed a division of the Scriptures into three classes—books of perfect authority, books of medium authority, and books of no authority. In the latter class would come the Song of Solomon, Esther, Jude, and perhaps a few others.

*(To be concluded.)*

## SERMONIC SECTION.

### *God's Curse upon the Serpent.*

BY RT. REV. WILLIAM R. NICHOLSON,  
D.D. [REF. EPIS.], PHILADELPHIA,  
PA.

*And the Lord said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And I will*

*put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.—Gen iii. 14, 15.*

THIS short passage is the seed plot of the whole Bible. A patch of ground not larger than half an acre may produce seed enough to stock a thousand acres. It is a wonderful adjustment of words. And as, when a student of nature stoops down and with knife or stick digs

up the wee bit of a hillock at his feet, he finds it to be the well-fashioned home of a colony of ants, every one of them illustrating lessons of wisdom, so let us take to pieces our text, and find in it what we may of the treasures of God's truth.

It is God who speaks. The time is that of man's fall, just after the great primeval sin—that opening of the fountain of poison and death which has deluged and ruined mankind. He is speaking in the hearing of Adam and Eve, but He addresses the serpent, whose tempting of them, with glozing lies, to eat of the forbidden fruit had won the human will to rebellion against God. To the serpent God says, "Because thou hast done this," etc.

Thus it is, God cursing the serpent. This is, indeed, but one of several subjects that lie enfolded in the text; but it is the one which is apparent on the surface, and must needs first engage our attention. Going back to the beginnings of things in human history, a wonderful scene is before us—a brute animal arraigned at the bar of judgment, and sentence pronounced against it for having ruined mankind. God's curse on the serpent—this is our subject.

First of all, was it a real serpent? May not the account of it be an allegory—that is to say, that the idea of a serpent and its doings, there being no material serpent present, is used as merely a picture of evil and its temptations, just as we may speak of a ship's voyage on the ocean as representing human life? But what right have we to suppose there was no serpent in that scene in Eden? And what is to hinder us from going on to suppose that nothing else in the narrative is literally real? If an allegorical serpent, then an allegorical Eve, an allegorical Adam, an allegorical Paradise; and so we should have nothing of a reliable history left. On the contrary, the narrative of the Fall is continued right on into all that follows precisely as a literal history would be. Besides, certainly literal is the judg-

ment pronounced on the serpent, as this day our very eyes attest; and so that on the woman and the man, and that on the ground. There is no allegory in the statement that the serpent should crawl on its belly, no allegory in the sorrows of child-bearing, no allegory in the thorns and thistles the ground should bring forth. Meanwhile St. Paul says plainly, "The serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety" (2 Cor. xi. 3). Yes, there was a real serpent.

But, while admitting that the narrative is not allegorical, it is still said, "May it not be here as simply a name of the devil?" We know that St. John calls the devil "that old serpent," just as Jesus called Herod "that fox." Andrew Jackson was called "Old Hickory;" and when it is said that "Old Hickory" was a great Indian fighter, General Jackson is understood, not a hickory-tree. So, when it is said the serpent did so and so, may it not mean the devil did so and so, no material serpent being present? Nay; for this serpent is described as "a beast of the field," and the devil is not a beast of the field. Again, the serpent is said to be "cursed above all cattle," or, as the margin of the Revised Version puts it, *from among* all cattle. This serpent, then, had been one of cattle; but the devil was never of cattle. No, it is not a metaphor. No doubt the devil was the moving power in the serpent in the temptation of Eve; but a serpent, an animal, there was; and from this fact the devil got his name, The Old Serpent. Nor does it conflict with the reality of the serpent that the narrative attributes to it both reason and speech. It was a case of diabolical possession. Once a legion of demons voluntarily entered into a herd of two thousand swine, and they ran violently down the steep and perished in the waters. And again and again evil spirits have taken possession of men, speaking through the men's own organs. There may be some such instances even now, especially in heathen lands. The devil was in the serpent,

and he it was who spoke and reasoned with the serpent's mouth. Possibly the serpent, before being degraded by the curse, may have had quasi organs of speech, as now the parrot has; or, if not, none the less that mighty fallen spirit, whose power we know to be tremendous, might have twisted the serpent's mouth into the articulating of words. When the Lord opened the mouth of Balaam's ass, the ass did talk and expostulate with Balaam (Num. xxii.), and St. Peter says of it, "The dumb ass, speaking with man's voice, forbade the madness of the prophet" (2 Peter ii.). A real serpent it was: and under the presidency of the devil it did speak and reason. So wondrously subtle because illuminated by Satan.

Our second point is, that upon this brute animal God pronounced His curse. Now wherefore? It was but the helpless instrument of the arch-fiend of evil. But in the Divine economy of our world repeatedly have both animate and inanimate objects been subjected to judicial decisions. It was God's Levitical law that if an ox gored a man, the ox must be put to death. Jesus cursed a fig-tree, and it withered away. Nay, the whole earth was cursed on account of man's sin, and covered over with thorns and briars; so that the serpent's curse was but one element in the sum total of the universal righteous malediction. Of God's purposes in so prodigious a procedure none is more manifest than that of giving instruction to man. To Adam and Eve the serpent was the ostensible source of their temptation and the producer of their ruin; and God's curse upon it would vividly present to their minds the dreadfulfulness of sin and the certainty of righteous retribution.

And now, thirdly, what was the effect on the serpent of God's curse upon it? An actual degrading of it in the scale of being. This is at once seen as regards its disposition. In that respect, at least, its condition of being was lowered. Said God, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman."

No enmity, then, had existed before. It had had no venom; it would not bite. We might think of it as even companionable. Thus radically changed was its disposition; changed, too, in an instant by the pronounced curse of God. Express proof is this that the curse did alter the serpent's condition of being; nor alone of this particular serpent, but of the whole reptile family, of which it became the representative, seeing that the enmity was put not alone between the serpent and the woman, but also between the seed of the one and the seed of the other, and should, therefore, continue in both to distant generations.

Now this being so expressly stated as to disposition, it follows that the other terms of the curse are to be understood as indicating further changes, even of form and structure. "On thy belly shalt thou go;" then it had not so gone before. "Dust shalt thou eat;" then dust it had not eaten before. "Cursed from among all cattle;" then it had been of the cattle class, not as now of creeping things; a marked distinction between cattle and creeping things being expressed in Gen. vi. 20.

So did the serpent fall. Deteriorated in disposition, deteriorated in form and structure, degraded in the scale of being. All cattle, as all other things, shared in the general curse that followed man's sin; but the serpent's curse had a specialty of infliction distinguishing it from the curse of all cattle. It was cursed *from among* all cattle. It sank out of the cattle class into the present reptile class; a unique instance of transmutation of species; not, however, by gradual evolution, but by God's judicial fiat. As Cain among men, so the serpent among animals was signally marked of God.

Thus it is probable that we are to conceive of the serpent of Eden as remarkable for its beauty of appearing. This is suggested by the deep debasement inflicted by the curse, as combined with the fact of Satan's making choice of it before the curse for fascinating



and misleading Eve. Superior must have been its status in the animal world ; and here even science comes to our aid. For science has discovered that the "footless, grovelling, venom-bearing" serpent of to-day had no existence under the reptile dynasty of the geological ages. Of the serpent of those ages, "the iguanodon," says Hugh Miller,\* "must have been quite as tall as the elephant ; the megalosaurus must at least have equalled the rhinoceros ; the hylæosaurus would have outweighed the hippopotamus." So that, instead of being an advance in form and structure, the serpent of to-day is a collapse and contraction, a dwindling and worsening. "Philosophical naturalists," says Hugh Miller,† "have selected it as representative of a reversed process in the course of being—of a downward sinking career." But, according to the general fact of advance in development, the serpent of Eden, as the latest development, could not have been otherwise, previously to the curse, than an improvement and refinement on what had gone before ; the flower and crown of that reptile world of the geological ages. And it is a curious thing that the "fiery flying serpents" which beset the Israelites in the wilderness are called seraphim. What? A serpent a seraph ! Surely this has a remarkable significance. Now those fiery flying serpents, whose bite was death, were evidently a reminder of that death-dealing tempter in Eden ; and so the designation of them as seraphic, indicating, perhaps, their splendence of color, would seem to suggest the splendor of the serpent of Eden. Altogether we may suppose it to have been exceedingly attractive, amiable, playful, companionable, harmless, of imposing form, walking, maybe flying, gorgeous. We may fancy Eve making it her pet. And we readily understand how all the more sensitive she would be to the diabolical sophistry assailing her as it came like music from the lips of the splendid

creature. Now from that exalted condition of animal being down, down to its present degradation, all the way from that to this, is the measure of the serpent's curse.

And now a great fact we have before us. This revolution in a creature's existence, so radical, instantaneous, the result of the Creator's judicial fiat, and for cause assigned, is an unusual provocative of thought. What, then, are some of the lessons it teaches ?

1. It illustrates the deteriorating effect of man's sin upon creation. For was the serpent race the only part of creation affected? As matter of fact, no. What are the facts? The ground was cursed, and, bringing forth thorns and thistles, it tainted with sorrow the food of the tiller of the soil. The atmosphere was cursed ; for, until he had sinned, man had no need of clothing ; whereas now the winds of winter are ever whistling their call to fleece and fur for shivering bodies, and the snow-storm's flaky white is to the earth as the white spot in a leper's skin. The forces of life are cursed, as the disposition of the serpent was revolutionized, for the worse ; and accordingly the poisonous vine and the deadly berry, the spiteful wasp and the stinging bee, the lion, the leopard, and the tiger are as plague spots on the handiwork of God. "The whole creation," says Paul, "groaneth and travaileth in pain together." These are the facts. And now to get an approximate impression of how much these facts mean, let in upon them the illustration from the far downward reach of the serpent's curse. For although, as we have seen, the extent of its degeneration is, in some degree, peculiar to itself, at the same time its own deeper depth is suggestive of proportionate depths in the degeneration of all things. By the extreme extent of the serpent's fall we may see that, if all things have not fallen as far, yet certainly they have fallen very far. We are wont to say that the world is so beautiful and has so much of joyance everywhere ; but what is its present

\* Footprints of the Creator.

† Testimony of the Rocks.

beauty to its primeval glories? Desperately tarnished must have become the universal aspect of things. If this beautiful world is not the wreck and ruin of its former self, as the serpent is, it is but a little better than that. Although many an object of creation God has not allowed to degenerate so far as, like the serpent or the tiger, to be in continuous outbreaking enmity against us; although in mercy He still grants us our domestic animals and our house pets, leaves to us the bracing qualities of the atmosphere, and permits rugged winter to sparkle with comfort; yet are such pleasures no more than as shadows of a harmony now inconceivable, no more than as dry bones of a now departed condition of nature. We talk of the enjoyable, we sniff the fragrance of the rose, we revel in the delights of music, we look with rapture, as well we may, on a sunset sky, whose cloud palaces are as burnished gold, whose empurpled splendor is as if it were a reflection of the royal glory of the City of God; but what is it all to the sights and sounds and smells of Eden's garden, to its sunrise and sunset, its songs of birds, its foliage and flowers, its ambrosial airs that kissed the tearless cheeks of Adam and Eve? Could we but have a peep into that lost paradise we would come back to our hills and vales that now we think so beautiful, to our lights and shadows, our forms and colors, our atmosphere and skies, as one might return from daylight and the upper air to a dark, dank, cheerless cave, and bitter would be our complaint. How dilapidated the world we live in! Oh, sin, sin, sin! the horror of creation, the slimy crawl of the serpent over all things.

2. The depth of the serpent's degeneration is suggestive of how far man himself has fallen. Of the fact of his having fallen we are plainly told. He degenerated physically. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return"—disease, decay, death. The serpent shall bite thy heel—accidents, calamities, suffering. "In the sweat of thy

face thou shalt eat bread"—toil, sorrow, fatigue, poverty, distress. "In sorrow thou shalt bring forth children"—the perpetuation of the race a matter of weakness and anguish. Man degenerated intellectually. His intuitive understanding at the first—how marked, how splendid, as shown in that quick perception of the differences of things, whereby, as by the flash of a sunbeam, he "gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field"! Whereas now he plods along in a tentative combination of ideas which we call reasoning; and in the sweat of his face, and with mistakes ever recurring, and not seldom in "confusion worse confounded" tugs at the task of distinguishing things that differ—just what the sinless Adam did in a glance of the eye. He degenerated morally. Evil he had come to know experimentally. A brood of feelings disturbing, unhappy, injurious, despicable, began to swarm within him. And these moral evils further weakened his intellect, wrapping it in a yet murkier gloom; for he had lost all idea of that purity, as a vestment for the body, which before had adorned him, and could think only that he was naked.

So did man fall. But how deep a depth is all this degeneration? By how long a space is man's present condition removed from what man was at the beginning? Now, if the serpent's connection with man's sin subjected that brute agent to so far-reaching a descent from its original, certainly the downward change inflicted on man for his own sin was in no lesser proportion to his original. What, then, must he have been in Paradise, since so great things do yet belong to him? His wondrous frame, his delightful social qualities, his brilliant powers of mind, his moral and Godward sensibilities—even all this wealth of present endowment is despicable in comparison of his magnificence in Eden; is only as the dirty shreds of a once regal purple, only as is now the disgusting, hateful serpent to the seraph-like creature of the garden.

We cannot now even think the bliss of Paradise. Sin! Oh, how revolting! the viper in the bosom, the dread anaconda constricting us in its folds, crushing us.

3. The serpent's curse demonstrates the judicial aspect of punishment. That punishment is nothing more than the suffering caused by violation of a law of nature is a favorite notion with some. The motive is to get rid of the thought that God Himself directly punishes. The only punishing, say they, is as when a man, who negligently exposes himself, takes cold; or as when a man who steals is stung by remorse. Strange, then, that society, instead of leaving the thief to the lashings of his conscience, shuts him up in prison. And so, they say, there is no need of a Saviour; that the only salvation is that of not repeating the wrongdoing, as, when one has burned himself, let him see to it that he put not his finger again into the fire. The principle of personal justice in the government of God they repudiate. But see, the serpent's punishment was not left to the course of natural law. There is no law of nature that could have brought about its debasement. In fact, God did personally administer upon the case of the serpent. He spoke, He gave sentence, He even reversed the laws of its creation, altering its form, altering its food, altering its disposition. "He spake, and it was done." It was punishment by personal interposition, by judicial infliction, direct, specific, and for cause assigned. God does punish sin. Violation of laws of nature, indeed, does bring suffering; but thereto He, the watchful sovereign, superadds His sentence of righteous wrath; and that sentence the worm that dieth not, that bites like a serpent and stings like an adder.

4. The serpent's curse illustrates our need of the Saviour. God's curse upon the brute agent required His curse upon the intelligent sinner. The curse upon man was as really his destruction as the curse upon the serpent was the abolition of its form and the bedevilment of its

disposition; and man became as helpless in his wretchedness as the serpent is powerless to rise and walk. There is no possible deliverance except in the Saviour. "The seed of the woman" must "bruise the serpent's head." Accordingly "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law being made a curse for us." The Old Serpent, the devil, bit his heel; but he, the seed of the woman, crushed the serpent's head.

5. Lastly, the serpent's curse illuminates the meaning of those Scriptures that speak of the final reversal of both creation's and man's curse. We are told that the time is coming when Paradise lost shall be succeeded by Paradise regained; when "there shall be no more curse," but "the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all His holy prophets since the world began." Now, as describing that restitution, we read that "God will make a covenant for men with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven, and with the creeping things of the ground;" that "no ravenous beast shall be there;" that "the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den [literally, on the eyeball of the basilisk]; the lion shall eat straw like the ox, the wolf dwell with the lamb, the calf and the young lion together, and a little child shall lead them." What does all this mean? Only figurative, say some. It is against nature that the basilisk should let a child finger its eyeball without harm; against nature that the lion should eat straw like an ox; that the wolf and the lamb should agree together. So it is against nature. But did not God by a word change the nature of the serpent?—its disposition, and it became venomous; its form, and it went on its belly; its food, and it began to eat dust. As literally, then, as the serpent and the wolf and the lion have been subjected to a reversal of nature and habitudes, so literally are they yet to undergo a reversal to what they were before man sinned. The very cobra shall be as a

plaything in the hands of a child, and gentle and playful shall have become the tiger. And as thus the whole animal world shall be regenerated, so shall literally come to pass all other wonderful things recorded of that time when "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

But one exception there shall be to that universal restitution: *the serpent shall still retain its degraded form.* Isaiah, while describing that its poison shall have gone, says, "And dust shall be the serpent's meat." Thus, while harmless and friendly, it shall be part of the universal harmony, yet shall it continue to be the same footless creature, going on its belly. Why is this? Because that degraded form is appointed to be, amid the glories of the restitution, like a lingering echo of man's fall. Enchanting will be the King in His beauty, rapturous the bliss of the redeemed; but often will they recount one to another the marvellous story of the olden time, and the still crawling serpent shall make vivid their recall of how sin entered into the world, and all its woe. Oh, God's hatred of sin is fearful! And God's mercy in Christ is precious. Choose ye this day with whom ye will affiliate—the seed of the serpent, or the seed of the woman?

#### **The Hope of the Calling.**

BY ALEXANDER MACLAREN, D.D.  
[BAPTIST], MANCHESTER, ENG.

*That ye may know what is the hope of His calling.*—Eph. i. 18.

A MAN'S prayers for others are a very fair thermometer of his own religious condition. What he asks for them will largely indicate what he thinks best for himself; and how he asks it will show the firmness of his own faith and the fervor of his own feeling. There is nothing colder than the intercession of a cold Christian; and, on the other hand, in no part of the fervid Apostle Paul's writings do his words come more

winged and fast, or his spirit glow with greater fervor of affection and holy desire than in his petitions for his friends.

In that great prayer of which my text forms a part we have his response to the good news that had reached him of the steadfastness in faith and abundance in love of these Ephesian Christians. As the best expression of his glad love he asks for them the knowledge of three things, of which my text is the first, and the other two are the "riches of the glory of the inheritance" and "the exceeding greatness of God's power."

Now if we take the "hope" in my text, as is often done, as meaning the thing hoped for, there seems to be but a shadowy difference between the first and the second of these subjects of the apostolic petition. Whereas, if we take it as meaning, not the object on which the emotion is fixed, but the emotion itself, then all the three stand in a natural gradation and connection. We have, first, the Christian emotion; then the object upon which it is fixed: "the glory of the inheritance;" then the power by which the latter is bought and the former is realized. I may perhaps consider the second and third of these petitions on some future occasion. For the present I confine myself to this first, the apostle's great desire for Christians who had already made considerable progress in the Christian life, "that they may know," by experiencing it, "what is the hope of His calling."

I. Now the first thought that these words suggest to me is this, that the Christian hope is based upon the facts of Christian experience.

What does the apostle mean by naming it "the hope of His calling"? He means this, that the great act of the Divine mercy revealed to us in the Gospel, by which God summons and invites men to Himself, will naturally produce in those who have yielded to it a hope of immortal and perfect life. Because God has called men, therefore the man who has yielded to the call may legitimately, and must, if he is to do his duty, cherish such a hope. It is clear enough

that this is so, inasmuch as, unless there be a heaven of completeness for us who have yielded to the summons and obeyed the invitation of God in His Gospel, His whole procedure is enigmatical and bewildering; the fact of the call is inexplicable; the cost of it is no less so. It was not worth while for God to make the world unless with respect to another which was to follow. It is still less worth His while to redeem the world if the results of that redemption, as they are exhibited here and now, and as they are capable of being exhibited in this present condition of things, are all that are to flow from it. It was not worth Christ's while to die, it was not worth God's while to send His Son, there was no sense and consistency in that great voice that echoes from heaven, calling us to love and serve Him, unless, beyond the jangling contradictions, and imperfect attainments, and foiled aspirations, and fragmentary faith, and broken services of earth, there be a region of completeness, where all that was tendency here shall have become effect; and all that was but in germ here, and sorely frostbitten by the ungenial climate, and shrivelled by the foul vapors in the atmosphere, shall blossom and burgeon into eternal life. The Christian life, as it is to-day, in its attainments and imperfections, is at once the witness of the reality of the power that has produced it, and clamantly calls for a sphere and environment in which that power shall be able to produce the effects which it is capable of producing.

God is "not a man that He should lie, nor the Son of man that He should repent." Men begin grand designs which never get further than the paper that they are drawn on; or they build a porch, and then they are bankrupt, or change their minds, or die, and the palace remains unrealized, and all that pass by mock and say, "This man began to build and was not able to finish." But God's designs are certain of accomplishment. The design that lies in the calling, unless we are to be reduced to a

state of utter intellectual bewilderment and confusion, and forego our belief in His veracity and resources to execute His designs, must needs lead on to the realm of perfectness. If we consider the agent by which it is effected, even the risen Christ; if we consider the cost at which it was accomplished, even the death on the Cross, the mission of His Son, and His assumption of the limitations of an incarnate life; if we consider the manifest potencies of the power that He has brought into operation in the present Christian life; and if we consider, side by side with these, the stark, staring contradictions and manifest inevitable limitations of the effects of that power, His calling carries in its depths the assurance that what He means shall be done, that Jesus Christ has not died in vain, that He has not ascended to fill a solitary throne, but is the Firstfruits of a great harvest; and that we shall one day be all that it is in the Gospel of our salvation to make us, unhindered by the limitations and unthwarted by the antagonisms of this poor, human life of ours. Unless there be a heaven in which all desires shall be satisfied, all evils removed, all good perfected, all ragged trees made symmetrical and full grown, and all souls that love Him radiant with His own perfect image, then the light that seemed a light from heaven is the most delusive of all the marsh-fires of earth, and nothing in the illusions of sense or of men's cunning is so cruel or so tragic as the calling that seemed to be the voice of God, and summoned us to a heaven which was only a dream.

II. And so, secondly, notice how this hope of our text is in some sense the very topstone of the Christian life.

Paul has heard concerning these people in Ephesus, of their faith and love. And because he has heard of these, therefore he brings this prayer. These two, the faith which apprehends the manifestation of God, in Jesus Christ, and the love which that faith produces in the heart that accepts the revelation of the infinite love, are crowned by,

and are imperfect without, and naturally lead on to, the brightness of this great hope. Faith—the reliance of the spirit upon the veracity of the revealing God—gives hope its contents, for the Christian hope is not spun out of our own imaginations, nor is it the mere making objective in a future life of the unfulfilled desires of this disappointing present, but it is the recognition by the trusting spirit of the great and starry truths that are flashed upon it by the Word of God. Faith draws back the curtain, and hope gazes into the supernal abysses. My hope, if it be anything else than the veriest will-o'-the-wisp and delusion, is the answer of my heart to the revealed truth of God.

Similarly the love which flows from faith not only necessarily leads on to the expectation of union being perfected with the object of its warm affection, but also so works upon the heart and character as that the false and seducing loves which draw away, like some sluice upon a river, the current of life from its true channel, are all sanctified and no more hinder hope. Loving we hope for that which, unless we loved, would not draw desires nor yield foretastes of sweetness which, like perfumed oil, feed the pure flame of hope.

The triad of Christian graces is completed by Hope. Without her fair presence something is wanting to the completeness of her elder sisters. The great Campanile at Florence, though it be inlaid with glowing marbles and fair sculptures, and perfect in its beauty, wants the gilded skyward-pointing pinnacle of its topmost pyramid; and so it stands incomplete. And thus faith and love need for their crowning and completion the topmost grace that looks up to the sky and is sure of a mansion there.

Brethren, our Christianity is woefully imperfect unless faith and love find their acme, their outstretching completion, in this Christian hope. Do you seek to complete your faith and love by a living hope full of immortality?

III. Thirdly, notice how this hope is

an all-important element in the Christian life.

The apostle asks for it as the best thing that can befall these Ephesian Christians, as the one thing that they need to make them strong and good and blessed. There are many other aspects of desire for them which appear in other parts of this letter. But here all Christian progress is regarded as being held in solution and included in vigorous hope.

Why is the activity of hope thus important for Christian life? Because it stimulates effort, calms sorrows, takes the fascination out of temptations, supplies a new aim for life and a new measure for the things of time and sense.

If we lived, as we ought to live, in the habitual apprehension of the great future awaiting all real Christians, would it not change the whole aspect of life? The world is very big when it is looked at from any point upon its surface; but suppose it could be looked at from the central sun, how large would it appear then? We can shift our station in like fashion, and then we get the true measure at once of the insignificance and of the greatness of life. This world means nothing worthy, except as an introduction to another. Not that thereby there will follow in any wise man contempt for the present, for the very same reference to the future which dwarfs the greatneses and dwindles the sorrows and almost extinguishes the dazzling lights of this present, does also lift it to its true significance and importance. It is the vestibule of that future, and that future is conditioned throughout by the results of the few years that we live here. An apprenticeship may be a very poor matter, looked at in itself; and the boy may say, What is the use of my working at all these trivial things? but since it is apprenticeship, it is worth while to attend to every trifle in its course, since attention to them will affect the standing of the man all his days.

Here and now we are getting ready for the great workshop yonder; learn-

ing the trick of the tools, and how to use our fingers and our powers, and when the schooling is done we shall be set to nobler work, and receive ample wages for the years here. Because that great "to-morrow will be as this day" of earthly life, "and much more abundant," therefore it is no trifle to work among the trifles; and nothing is small which may tell on our condition yonder. The least deflection from the straight line, however acute may be the angle which the divergent lines enclose at the starting, and however small may seem to be the deviation from the course, will, if prolonged to infinity, have room between the two for all the stars, and the distance between them will be that the one is in heaven and the other is in hell. And so it is a great thing to live among the little things, and life gains its true significance when we dwarf and magnify it by linking it with the world to come.

If we only kept that hope bright before us, how little discomforts and sorrows and troubles would matter! Life would become "a solemn scorn of ills." It does not matter much what kind of cabin accommodation we have if we are only going a short voyage; the main thing is to make the port. If we, as Christian people, cherish, as we ought to do, this great hope, then we shall be able to control, and *not* to despise, but to exalt this fleeting and transient scene, because it is linked inseparably with the life that is to come.

#### IV. Lastly, this hope needs enlightened eyes.

The apostle prays that God may give these Ephesians "the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of Him," and then he adds, as the result of that gift, the desire that the Ephesian believers may have "the eyes of their hearts enlightened." That is a remarkable expression. It does not mean, as an English reader might suppose it to mean, that the affections are the agents by which this knowledge reaches us; but "heart" here is used, as it often is in Scripture, as a general expression for

the whole inward life, and all that the apostle means is that, by the gift of the Divine Spirit of wisdom, a man's inner nature may be so touched as to be capable of perceiving and grasping the "hope of the calling."

Observe, too, the language, "that ye may know the hope." How can you *know* a hope? How do you know any kind of feeling? By having it. The only way of knowing what is the hope is to hope, and this is only possible by dint of these eyes of the understanding being enlightened. For our inward nature, as we have it, and as we use it, without the touch of that Divine Spirit, is so engrossed with this present that the far-off blessedness to which my text refers has no chance of entering there. No man can look at something beside him with one eye, and at something half a mile off with the other. You have to focus the eye according to the object; and he that is gazing upon the near is thereby made blind to that which is afar off. If we go crawling along the low levels with our eyes upon the dust, then of course we cannot see the crown above.

We need more than the historical revelation of the light in order to enlighten the inward nature. There is many a man here now who knows all about the immortality that is brought to light by Jesus Christ just as well as the Christian man whose soul is full of the hope of it, and who yet, for all his knowledge, does not know the hope, because he has not felt it. You have to get further than to the acceptance intellectually of the historical facts of a risen and ascended Saviour before there can be, in your heart, any vital hope of immortality. The inward eye must be cleared and strengthened, cross lights must be shut out so that we may direct the single eye of our hearts toward the great objects which alone are worthy of its fixed contemplation. And we cannot do that without a Divine help, that Spirit of wisdom which will fill our hearts if we ask for it, which will fix our affections, which will clear our eye-

sight, which will withdraw it from seeing vanity as well as give it reality to see.

But we must observe the conditions. Since this clearness of hope comes not merely from the acceptance as a truth of the fact of Christ's resurrection and ascension, but comes through the gift of that Divine Spirit, then to have it you must ask for it. Christian people, do you ask for it? Do you ever pray—I do not mean in words, but in real desire—that God would help you to keep steadily before you that great future to which we are all going so fast? If you do you will get the answer. Seek for that Spirit; use it, and do not resist its touches. Do not fix your gaze on the world when God is trying to draw you to fix it upon Himself. Think more about Jesus Christ, more about God's high calling, live nearer to Him, and try more honestly, more earnestly, more prayerfully, more habitually, even amid all the troubles and difficulties and trivialities of each day, to cultivate that great faculty of joyful and assured hope.

Surely God did not endue us with the power of hoping that we might fling it all away on trivial, transient things. We are all far too short-sighted; our fault is, not that we do not hope, but that we hope for such near things, for such small things, like the old mariners who had no compass nor sextant, and were obliged to creep timidly along the coasts and steer from headland to headland. But we ought to launch boldly out into mid-ocean, knowing that we have before us that star that cannot guide us amiss. Do not set your hopes on the things that perish, for if you do, hopes fulfilled and hopes disappointed will be equally bitter in your mouths. And you older people who, like myself, are drawing near the end of your days, and have little else left to hope for in this world, do you see to it that your anticipations extend "above the ruinable skies."

There is an object beyond experience, above imagination, without example,

for which the creation wants a comparison, we an apprehension, and the Word of God itself a sufficient revelation. "It doth not yet appear what we shall be." God hath called us to His eternal kingdom and glory. Let us seek to walk in the light of the "hope of His calling."

#### **Jew, Greek, and Christian.**

BY ALEX. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D. [CONGREGATIONAL], EAST DULWICH, ENG.

*For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom. But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and unto the Greeks foolishness; but unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.*  
—1 Cor. i. 22-24.

THIS chapter is full of the tragic pathos of the apostle's life. We can read, as it were, between the lines the emotions, the hopes, the despairs, the fears, the loves, amid which he preached in Corinth, confronted by the hate of the Jew, and the scorn of the Greek, which yet could neither damp nor quench his courage. The Christian of to-day can but ill understand the Christian of the year 50. Perhaps if he did he might feel much more as did the Greek, or the Jew, than as did the Christian. We are actively engaged in trying to perfect the worship of God into the last and finest of the fine arts. We demand that it "lap us in soft Lydian airs," we measure its fitness by its beauty, and it is great as it is agreeable. The best of its excellence is the sensuous pleasure it can give or gratification it can afford. We think less of the awfulness of God and the worship of Him by mortal and sinful man, than of the fitness and harmony of all the parts of what we please to call the service. The greatest of the Puritans was familiar with the cloistered walk and pale; he loved

The high embow'd roof,  
With antic pillars massy proof,  
And storied windows richly dight,  
Casting a dim religious light.



He loved to hear

. . . The pealing organ blow  
To the full voic'd choir below,  
In service high, and anthems clear,  
As may with sweetness, through mine ear,  
Dissolve me into ecstasies,  
And bring all heaven before mine eyes.

But he came to feel that there were sublimer things than these, that the solitude of a soul, or the simplicity of worship wherein man tried to meet his God, and laid himself open that God might enter and possess and command the man, was sublimer far. The stately cathedral remained magnificent, but sublimer than the stateliest ever built, and more beautiful than the grandest worship man ever organized, is the coming of the lone and desolate and needy, yet yearning soul, to God that seeks him, sure that it is happy only as found of God. He who would know the simplicity of the earliest day would find within it how perfect was the finding of God through the very poverty of man.

Think of Paul and the conditions in which he there, in Corinth, tried to worship. The history behind him had been one of trouble. The man of Macedonia had appeared and cried, "Come over and help." To him to hear was to obey. He landed at Philippi, bringing west and into Europe the great Gospel of Christ; but it met him in the cold, hard way of the world, beat him, smote him with stripes, set him fast in the inner prison. Then he had to escape to Thessalonica, and "lewd fellows of the baser sort" set the city in an uproar, and compelled the apostle once more to escape, and he went on to Athens, and there he felt the wondrous charm of the city, the wondrous indifference of the men. They looked at him with the curious scorn that has marked self-conscious culture ever since conscious culture was, and they said, "What doth this babbler say?" They wanted news, but the kind of news that makes a giddy life giddier, not the kind of news that brought good news for lost men. Yet it was a new experience, and they met

him in the market-place and argued, and they set him on Mars Hill, and listened till he came to the great application of his doctrine, and then they observed in mockery, "We shall hear thee again, perhaps." But he went on from cultured Athens to busy Corinth, there to stay awhile. The city was rich. In it you could find the Jews, base sometimes and poor, doing meanest work, rich sometimes, well known on the Exchange, and able to play as it profited him most, now the "bear" and now the "bull."

There, too, he found the Greek, argumentative in his very commerce, and beating out all questions connected with the principles and profits of trade. There, too, was the Roman, with the spirit of the soldier, scornful of the poor civilian and the meaner merchant, thinking the world had been made to be conquered, and he the conqueror of the world. And Paul preached, and the Jew scornfully hated and despised; the Greek smiled in his large disdain; the Roman tolerated in his proud indifference; and you might have seen him some evening stealing along the quay, watched by few, cared for by fewer, the mean-looking little Hebrew, who still could not be conquered, but resolved that his Gospel should conquer men, finding entrance by a mean stair to a meaner upper room, where the slave set free for an hour by his master, or the wharfinger escaping from loading and unloading his ship, or the porter seeking release from his weary burden by day, met with their small offerings to hear the mean preacher, great, in spite of his meanness, in dignity and in power. Historic imagination is a great thing for the student. It can enable him in a prosaic age to live in an heroic past, to call up in the mysterious chamber of his imagination times that were and are not, till chivalrous men and gay women live before his eye and seem to breathe the breath of life. And as he has seen he makes to live on the printed page; and the idle and the empty read what he has creat-

ed, and feel as if they were transported from the mean moment to a grander time. But the historic and creative and interpretive imagination in the preacher is a harder and a more painful gift. Had Peter gone to Corinth, Peter would have preached and hardly known, and less cared, how people thought and what they felt; but the keen, creative spirit of Paul could insert itself into the brain of the Roman and look through his eyes; into the intellect of the Greek, and judge with his cynicism; into the imagination of the Hebrew, and feel with his heart, dream with his fancy. And as he looked he could read, translating that scowl on the Hebrew face into bitter speech, that scorn on the Greek lip into eloquent reproach. What cared he for the thoughts of men? God sent him. "Ye think what ye call your service is worship, for your worship is from the side of man, while God is silent." This preacher in Corinth spoke from God. Worship was good because the speech was God's speech, bringing its truth, changing the heart, and making the men that came God-found and reconciled to Him. So he preached his word, and by demonstration of the Spirit and power the word prevailed. Yet here you have the reminiscence of the older time, and that reminiscence comes out in three series of antitheses.

First, there are three typical persons—the Jew, the Greek, the Christian. Secondly, the three typical persons have three characteristic quests. The Jew requires a sign; the Greek seeks after wisdom; the Christian preaches Christ. Thirdly, there are three typical attitudes of the one subject. Christ is to the Jew a stumbling-block, to the Greek foolishness, to the Christian the power and the wisdom of God. What the Jew demanded was a vision of power; what the Greek sought was a source of wisdom; what the Christian found was power and wisdom in one.

Look, then, at these three persons with their characteristic quests and attitudes. They are old, they are new;

they belong to nineteen centuries distant; they live to-day. Suppose, then, the preacher depicts the past, and the hearer reads in the past depicted the present. What has been is and now. Where you meet and as you live you may still see the Jew seeking his sign, the Greek his wisdom, the Christian possessed of his Christ. The Jew, proud man was he; illustrious was his ancestry, and in the face of great Rome or wise Greece he could feel that he was in the face of people that were of yesterday and of earth, while he was of eternity and of God. His founder and father was Abraham, called out of Chaldean Ur, friend of God, greatest of faithful men; his lawgiver was Moses, no man of Draconian severity, no giver of a law like Solon made by human wisdom, author of a law straight come from God. The law he bestowed was not a creation of human wisdom. God made it; out of heaven it came. Other nations had prophets; other nations had heroes; he had prophets and saints. The literature possessed of Greece, boasted of Rome, was of the earth; his was a book God made; he owned the very Book of God. Nay, they worshipped idols; he worshipped the one Creator of heaven and earth. And so, proud man was the Jew, proudest for this reason—he owned God rather than God owned him. He so owned God that he determined the very terms on which God was to be held and known by other men. He said, "You must be circumcised by me; you must become a member of my nation; you must accept my synagogue and my temple, or you cannot have my God. Covenanted mercies are the mercies I have; all outside me belongs to the sphere of the great uncovenanted. If men would have God, Jews must men become; only as they participate in my orders can they possess my God." There are two kinds of atheism—what we may call by contrast a noble, what we must call by contrast a meaner. There is the sublimer and more generous; there is the more ignoble and mean. The nobler

says, "There is no God;" the meaner says, "There is a God, but for me only, and man can have Him only as I will, through my instruments. He who holds the place of the Jew, what does he but appropriate God," saying, "He is mine, not thine," saying, "He is to be possessed on my terms, not His own; I am the one channel through which He reaches men; save through me He is not in any legitimate sense for mankind." And so he said, when he stood before the new Gospel, "Show me a sign." The craving was for a miracle, but by the very terms no miracle was possible. The Jew said, "I am God's great work: a greater than I is not in the world, since I am the witness of the supernatural, and without me no supernatural were: I am the sign; show me a greater." Ah Jew! if thou hadst been able to see the Christ thou hadst seen a greater. Think of Him; child, He is of thine own proud race, yet lowly in heart, giving rest unto the soul. Thou hast cause for pride, O Jew, yet greater still for humiliation. Out of thy loins He sprung; yet for Him thou only hadst the cross. From thy fathers He came; greatest of all that into this world did ever come, yet what hadst thou for Him but suffering and death. See how He "broke His birth's invidious bar;" see how, breaking it, He became no local, narrow Jew, but Son of Man yet Son of God. See how through Him, by Him, God became the new Being for man—not narrow, not local, but universal, seeking all, accessible to all. What was the name He found for that God? Father, Father of men, with the emotions of love, of infinite yearning, insatiable paternity, that loves no living sorrow, that seeks to lift, to change the living sorrow into living joy. That Father of all, seeking all, seeks all in Him. He stands manifest God, witness to this eternal truth, that man's sin is God's sorrow, man's saving God's suffering, that no evil to the child can come that is not greater evil to the infinite and eternal Father. And then, as its counterpart on earth,

that it may be responsive to heaven, lives and abides the Son. All over earth from thousands, from millions of faces turned heavenward, the cry has risen for the God, for the Father. Out of heaven the Father stoops to seek the sons. Here through His Son He comes to create a great family of God, to turn this confused, divided, troubled earth into one great and holy brotherhood. Think of the Jew with his proud claim, separating man from man by the way in which he makes God the great divider. See Christ with the eternal Father seeking immortal sons; how through recognition of the Father He makes them brothers, and the man who is a Greek becomes a man, and the man who is a Jew becomes a man, Roman forgets empire, Hindoo forgets color, negro loses slavery, male ceases to be man, female ceases to be woman; all become one in Christ. How glorious that sign! Miracle ye claim and seek, O Jew! to you a miracle I bring! See the revelation of the eternal God as a reconciliation to the mortal man-family created on earth through filiation to heaven.

But look at the Greek. The Greek, too, had his illustrious ancestry; he, too, claimed as great a miracle as the Hebrew in the course of history. Where Providence reigns there is no great or little, there is no necessary or exceptional. Providence means order. Think, then, of this Greek's place in the great preparation for Christ, in the great progress of man. Think of the discoveries he made, adding to the pomp yet to the fruitfulness and the dignity of human life. He made this great discovery—freedom, manhood through freedom. Did you ever think what you owe to the people who first created a free city, a state of free men? Read the inscriptions of Assyrian kings that tell you how they in their might vanquished armies, but tell you not of the armies they lost and the armies they destroyed without pity or regret. Read the records of Egyptian monuments, and they will tell how a great king to preserve his very dust builds a mighty

pyramid, throwing thousands of men away in the building of it, the unnamed going down to an unremembered death to preserve the memory of one man. The Greek, in creating a free state, created the very idea of manhood. Man free is man reasonable, ordered, a social, joyous, complete life. Then, think, he, too, discovered for all time art and beauty. Take those colossal figures standing by the Nile, that have been thence distributed throughout the world, cold, impassive; take those great Assyrian monarchs—massive, insensible to pity, sensible only of power; or look at the Hindoo, with his god—many-headed, many-armed, many-breasted, hideous symbol of a race without beauty; take the Greek discovering the human form is divine, making of all the curls that cluster round his head a greater power than the thunderbolt, through the very possession and passion of perfect manhood, so that the great artist passing in to look upon the statue of Zeus, comes away awed with reverence, saying, "Lo, I have beheld God!" Can you tell how great the good man owes to the race that discovered beauty in men? Look at poetry. Pithy speech for deepest emotion; lyric where the passion of the moment, the heart penned and confined, breaks into speech that seems to float in tears; or epic, exhibiting the conflict of gods and men, of mighty forces, of rational and irrational; or drama, along its dread way, where will struggles with destiny, and in the very hour in which it is crushed triumphs over the destiny that crushes it. Think, too, what philosophy means, the passion for the true, the search for the good, and as we owe art, we owe no less the glory of poetry, and the majesty of philosophy, to the Greek; but when you spoke to him of Christ he turned away and said, "Where is the wisdom? He is a barbarian and uses speech that cannot with grace or truth be called language. Think of Him, too, as your later artist pictured Him, crowned with thorns, pitiful in His very pity, an object that

does not speak of manhood, but speaks only of weeping, of the marred visage. We love the gracious and we love the great; we love not this." But, O Greek! hast thou thought of the meaning of that Christ? You love freedom; you made it. Ah! freedom, to man, a citizen, freedom to man being grand, immortal; but see how you bind him still in passion that makes him a very slave. This Christ can take the man bound in the bondage of sin, held by the slavery of lust, fettered round by evil habit and evil passion, can make him a free man who loves the law of God, and loves to obey it, make him a citizen not of any Greek city, but of an eternal Kingdom, a being who, in the very moment of his mortal existence moves in immortality, in the very hour of his apparent weakness has around him and within him the power of God. You made art, and though art is beautiful, think of the beauty that is in Christ, see how radiant the goodness, how rare the loveliness that makes Him alone "the altogether lovely." He creates the rarer art of holy being, the rarer art of holy living. He creates a beauty so beautiful that the inmost soul alone can see it, and see it as ravished forever and wrapt into an ecstasy of admiration and of love. You think your poetry is great; but, see, He has made all time, He has made all the universe—nay, He has made the very eternity itself, poetical. Has He not shown the conflict of eternal love with temporal sin? Has He not shown this wayward world struggling away from God, sought by the God it struggles from? Has He not filled every life that is lived with poetic meaning, vast as eternity, large as deity, by bringing deity into humanity, by lifting humanity into deity. Poetry! What of the greatest of its feats and the mightiest of its achievements, can for one hour or one moment be measured alongside what lies in Christ? And is it thy wisdom, O Greek! thy proud, which is yet thy vain, philosophy, that thou lovest? See, then, in this Christ is the great mystery of being—God that

made the world, the end to which God made it, the means by which He is to reach His end, the glorious method by which the scattered and multitudinous creatures who have estranged themselves from Him may yet, through holy concord, and beautiful love, and perfect devotion, be brought into a saved society in Him. O Greek! thou didst seek perfect freedom, perfect beauty, perfect poetry, perfect philosophy, and thou didst turn from the Christ, thinking that none of these could be found in Him, and, lo! in Him are all the treasures of wisdom and of knowledge, lo! in Him thou hast all things, all things can obtain, and yet abound.

What shall I say of the Christian, his attitude and his quest? It is said, "if thou wouldst know a poet, go and live in the poet's land," meaning that till you knew the speech and the experience of the poet yourself, never could you know him. So, if you would know Christ, make your appeal to Christian experience. It, and it alone, can teach. Two things are in Him—power, wisdom. Power is causal, creative; power made the world be, keeps the world in being; wisdom is adaptative, constructive, brings order and design where great power works. Christ brings to the making, to the re-making of men power and wisdom—power that can take the lapsed, the lost, the basest, and re-make it till it becomes the holiest; wisdom to take what He has re-made, and shape, develop, guide it, until its early promise becomes richest performance, and its struggling into being passes into glorious harmony and beauty. See this poor dark earth, look at these disordered men, men with passions in them, warmed as it were by the devil, and fanned as it were by the infamy of hell; look at this earth, where war has prevailed, where a darker thing than war has held impassioned sway; look at evil, not confined to the lowest—encouraged in the highest places; look at evil, nurtured and nourishing itself by feeding on all that is noblest, and wasting what it feeds on in man

and man's being. Then see how Christ can take the man at his worst and the woman at her basest, and out of them make saints that can love God and that God has loved; make saints that can cause the very breath of the world to grow fragrant and the very heart of the world to grow tender. There is power in Christ, for He is able to save to the uttermost; there is wisdom in Christ, for Christ can sanctify what He has saved. Now you are face to face with the evil and the need of men: what other way can you cure it? You may call to your aid philosophy. Philosophy will make a select and cultured class, scornful of the multitude, and growing cynical through the sense of its own pre-eminence. Call in social theory, that argues that new conditions must be created that men may be made happy and perfect. You may invoke the Act of Parliament; you may imagine, with that faith that is so pitiful and so pathetic, that Acts of Parliament can do all that men may need; you may invoke these, and yet all these together fail to do that which Christ has achieved. He, making new persons, can create new conditions; He, making new men, can make a new world. Do not think I, for one, despise any effort used to make conditions happier, used to make wealth take a wider distribution, used to remove one single wrong. No; whatever is wrong I would righten by Parliament, by any social agency whatever. Just and fit and right—this is the supreme thing. You will make new conditions through new men. New conditions will not make old men young men, with fresh glad life within them. This is the great achievement of Christ. He makes men, and through the men He makes He saves the world.

---

You cannot tabulate this business of Gospel preaching. It is utterly impossible. The issues are from eternity to eternity. They are far too delicate and interwoven, and subtle for any possible calculation.—*McNeill.*

**The Preservative Power of Integrity.**

BY REV. GEORGE A. PAULL [PRESBYTERIAN], BLOOMFIELD, N. J.

*Let integrity and uprightness preserve me, for I wait on Thee.*—Psalms xxv. 21.

THIS is a prayer for the possession of integrity and uprightness, for those two virtues will most certainly preserve any one who possesses them. They are the two great moral preservatives. A man who has them as the buttresses of his life need not fear falling and being broken. He is insured against those dangers.

My design this morning is to illustrate the character that is marked by integrity and uprightness, to show its strength and beauty; and if we succeed in getting a clear view of such a character, we shall all, coveting the best things, offer the prayer of the text, "Let integrity and uprightness preserve me."

I. There is the word integrity.

Some of you may see the word "integer" peeping out of this word. If so, you will probably transfer some mathematical associations to it, and they will prove good illustrations of the subject. The text-books on arithmetic which were studied some years ago, always used to call a whole number an "integer," and the present text-books perhaps do the same. There is that association of ideas, then, between arithmetic and integrity. Integrity is the state of being an "integer," a *whole* thing, not a half, nor a quarter, nor any fractional part. Integrity is wholeness, entireness.

And you will all agree, doubtless, that mathematics is a plain and comparatively easy science as long as it deals with integers, the "untouched," unbroken figures. We can all add, and subtract, and multiply whole numbers; but the instant fractions are introduced the trouble begins. Fractions are broken things, and they may be broken in all sorts of ways, and into any number of parts, whence arise mixed, and improper, and compound, and complex fractions,

and a host of fragments that will not fit together. How we sigh for the plain and honest integers after we have wrestled with the vast complexity of fractions!

Now it is exactly the same in life. Integrity of character is wholeness and completeness, and it issues in simplicity. The life is all of one piece. There is no complexity of motive. The man who can say with the apostle, "This one thing I do," is an integer, a man of integrity. And his integrity preserves him. He saves both himself and others from a multitude of vexing and difficult questions—questions of conduct, questions of expediency, questions which lie on the border-line between right and wrong. The most difficult questions in all life are not the questions which touch large and important decisions. There is generally about such things a preponderance of right or wrong which the conscience can easily weigh and decide. Among the great mass of two armies encamped near each other, no one doubts where the soldiers in the centre of each camp belong. But among the stragglers and skulkers and men who hover on the outskirts of the two armies, it is not so easy to decide. They may belong to either; perhaps they hardly know themselves which army they prefer. They are the fractions. The integrity of the army lies in its broad spreading camp.

There are some who think that the difficulties of the Christian life are all encountered by those who are devoted and notable Christians. That is a great mistake. Not only does the Tempter fear determination, and flee from it, but a thousand temptations to doubtful courses of conduct, and the perplexity and unrest which they bring, are avoided by the thorough-going Christian. "This one thing I do," I press on toward God; that preserves him in a multitude of cases.

It is always important that Christians who go into society and enter into social diversions and pleasures should go as Christians, and nothing else and

nothing less. They should let it be known distinctly that they are Christians. If they are wholly Christians they are safe. It is the half-and-half people that are in danger. The first thing a Christian should do on ship-board, where he is to mingle for a week or more with chance acquaintances, is to register somewhere and somehow as a Christian. Who knows but by so doing he may save both himself and some of those who sail with him? The men and women of Christian integrity have just one law of life—that is, the law of Christ—not the customs and usages of society, and not half society and half Christ. When the two come in conflict, there can be no hesitation as to which shall be obeyed. Integrity decides that—it is a whole number, and cannot be divided.

So it is in business. Integrity of character is the only safeguard and bulwark. It takes a whole man to do just right in these times, when there are so many temptations to dishonesty and fraud, and so many more to doubtful policies. Nevertheless, no man can afford to be dishonest, to lie, or to do wrong. It breaks up the wholeness of his character; after that it is fragmentary, and will go to pieces little by little. No one should steal unless he is willing to lie. That is utter folly. Take away any part of integrity, and you disintegrate the character. "Disintegrate" is another word related to integrity. It is used with reference to stone. Rocks are disintegrated by the action of air and water. How is it done? Not by blows or dynamite, but by a slow, insidious destruction of the cohesion by which all their particles are held together. And more characters are disintegrated than are blasted. Let pure pervading truth hold the character in its embrace, and it cannot be separated into fragments.

You can subtract from a whole number and it is a whole number still; but you cannot divide it with safety; there you are apt to run into fractions. Job was a man of integrity, "a perfect and

an upright man." And the Lord allowed Satan to perform a sum in subtraction on Job. He subtracted from his worldly substance, camels and sheep and oxen; from his family, sons and daughters; from Job himself, health and strength. The poor man had not much left as he sat in sackcloth and ashes. But he was a whole man still. "What," said his wife, "dost thou still hold fast thine integrity? Curse God and die." But he said unto her, "Thou speakest as one of the foolish women speaketh. Shall we receive good at the hands of the Lord, and not evil?" And to his friends he said, "Till I die I will hold fast mine integrity."

It may reduce a man to poverty to do so, but he keeps his character whole, and his character is his priceless jewel. Division of interest, motive, or heart is a great deal more to be feared than any subtraction; for a divided heart, cleaving half to good and half to evil, disintegrates the jewel.

Take two business men who are tempted to dishonesty, one of whom resists and the other of whom yields to the temptation, and consider which of them is the happier man. The one who yields adds to his worldly property, but is himself divided. Honesty subtracts from the other man, but leaves his character untouched. Which of them is the happier man? Washington Gladden well says, "If you have any difficulty in answering such questions, may God have mercy on your soul. Not to know and feel that losses which come through integrity are more to be desired than gains that come through sin is to be in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity."

It is only when a man's character becomes fractional—that is, broken—that complications arise in his life. Then he is torn asunder by conflicting desires and motives. He has lost his consistency and steadiness. Part of him pulls one way and part another. He allows a little sin to mingle with his good. He makes allowance, perhaps, for only

one besetting sin among much good, but how true it is that "a double-minded man is unstable in all his ways." You can never tell which way he will go, because he has no integrity, no completeness. That want of singleness of aim and purpose introduces weakness into his whole life. It is a law in morality as well as mechanics that nothing is stronger than its weakest point. Here is an anchor lying on a vessel's deck in rusty coils, to be used to hold the ship from driving on the rocks in a storm. The captain examines the chain and finds every link stout and strong except one. Just one has a flaw in it. The captain says, "This is a good chain on the whole; one weak spot, but otherwise all right. It will answer." And so, out in the storm, the good chain is let down and the anchor takes hold, and the ship pulls and tugs at the chain, and all the links hold firm but one. That breaks, and the whole chain is as weak as that weakest link.

Or take the vessel itself. If it is all stanch and strong except in one spot below the water-line, will you sail in it? Just one weak place among the hundred feet of solid timber! Yet the ship has lost its integrity thereby, and the one weak spot makes the whole ship weak and dangerous.

Do you think we can afford to make allowance for one weak point in our characters that breaks our integrity? No man is stronger than his weakest point. Instead of making allowances for a fraction of weakness, we must concentrate every force there. That is the critical point. James says, "Whoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." This word integrity says the same thing. It is completeness. It drops not a single link in the golden chain of righteousness.

The other virtue which is mentioned in the text is uprightness. If anything besides integrity is needed to preserve a man, it is just this one other thing—uprightness. The word is a picture in

itself. It suggests to our minds first the upright bearing of a man physically, so contrary to the anatomy of the lower animals. Even those animals which some naturalists have posed as the ancestors of man stand upright only by constraint. Their natural position is on all fours. Man alone walks erect. As early as the time of Sallust the uprightness of man was made the text for an oration which began, "It becomes all men who desire themselves to excel the other animals, to strive with all their might lest they pass their life in insignificance, like the beasts, which nature has formed bending down and obedient to their animal appetites." And this upright figure is a type of what the character should be. It would be a thousand pities if the erect figure should be joined to a degraded character, if the upright form should contain a grovelling spirit. A man had better be a beast at once, for then there would be no incongruity between form and character. We were made to lift our eyes to the stars; our characters should have no lower goal. Uprightness expresses the high destiny of man.

Why is uprightness a moral preservative? Because it is the position which offers least advantage to destructive forces. The forces which ruin the soul are, without exception, downward forces; their power is expended in pulling down. The building which best resists gravitation is the perpendicular building. Let a building incline the least bit in any direction, and gravitation gets a hold on it and begins to pull down. The easiest bodily position in standing is straight up and down. Try standing half bent over and see how soon you tire.

Say, then, we are trying to build up a character which will stand solidly and surely, and resist all downward tendencies; it is like building a tower. It must be upright. It must be built with the line and plummet of righteousness. Then the downward forces may pull and pull, and never get a hold upon it. Its uprightness preserves it. The more



the downward forces act upon it the more do they settle it upon its foundation. Uprightness is the only safe and the only easy position. I never saw the Leaning Tower of Pisa, but I always wonder if people who do see it are not possessed to try and straighten it, and whether they do not go through a series of bodily contortions in their desire to get it upright. At any rate, it is an object of curiosity rather than a thing of beauty. As to moral obliquity, characters that lean to one side or that have a twist in them, we feel that they are essentially unsafe. We cannot trust them. And they are ugly; we want to straighten them. Then let us apply this to ourselves. Let us lay the plummet to our own lives. Let us get the twists and turns out of our characters.

So I say, if there is one thing beside integrity needed to keep one firm and true, it is uprightness. One may be whole-hearted and consistent; such a character will never go to pieces. But unless it is whole and entire in the right direction, it may fall down. An upright character will never fall down. "Let integrity and uprightnes preserve me."

Practically, however, the two things are very much the same. An upright man is a man of integrity, and a man of integrity is an upright man. If we should try to put into a single phrase all that is expressed by the two words, it would be "perfect conformity to God's will." And we should emphasize the first word, Perfect conformity to God's will. The character we have been speaking of consists in nothing less than that. And at once you start back and say, "That is impossible." Well, suppose it is. I grant that integrity cannot be predicated of any human being, but why are people so afraid of aiming at perfection? Is it any easier to take a low aim than a high aim? Will any one be better by aiming at imperfection than at perfection? The whole course of this sermon has gone to show that true nobility and true safety consist in the highest possible at-

tainments. We have been speaking of uprightnes*—i.e.*, something straight up and down. Now you cannot draw a perfectly straight line. The thing has never been done. But yet if you expect to be an artist you must keep trying to do that very thing, and the longer and more faithfully you try the nearer you will come to it. "Absolute exactness in drawing never was achieved and never will be; but there have been many artists whose work was approximately accurate and very beautiful. It would not have been so accurate nor so beautiful if they had not tried to make it perfect."

That is the way the principle works. It is not useless to aim at perfection, because we cannot reach perfection. On the contrary, the only way in the world to approximate to perfection is to aim at integrity and uprightnes.

So many people, however, shrink from the high ideal of the Christian life. They seem to be afraid to be out-and-out Christians. But if it is worth while to be a Christian at all, it is worth while to be a whole Christian. If Christ is worth anything in the life, He is worth everything. And yet there are comparatively few who let Christ take full possession of their hearts and lives. Many give Him part of their love and energy, but few are entirely consecrated.

Consecration in a young Christian is the most beautiful thing I know. It is beautiful enough to see the serenity and ripeness of age glowing in the sunlight of God's smile. But that is the autumnal fruit. It is more beautiful and more cheering to see the blossoms of spring, with all their promise of abundant fruitfulness. That is the consecration of the young in the dew of their youth. My dear young people, let Christ have *all* of you. You will not be happy Christians, you will not be useful Christians, you will not win others to your Saviour, unless you are wholly consecrated. That means two things. It means giving yourself as an "integer" to Christ, not dividing up your interests into fractions and giving

him a forth, or a third, or even a half. It means the *whole*. And it means doing this *always*, not growing weary in well-doing and stopping it after awhile. Press on patiently and perseveringly.

Notice how the text closes, "For I wait on Thee." I *wait* on Thee. That is not idleness; it is a concentration of attention. Let your eyes be fixed upon God, waiting. Let His moulding hand be laid upon your lives, and allow it to rest there, to remain upon your lives until its impress is fixed. Remember the promise to all God's waiting ones, "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up on wings as eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint."

"The path of the just is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." It leads on to perfection, and we must steadily pursue it. We must aim to do the right perfectly whenever the right is shown, to refuse the wrong utterly whenever the wrong is seen—in two words, to be whole-hearted and upright.

"Let integrity and uprightness preserve me, for I wait on Thee."

### **The Feast of Life—A Sacramental Study.**

By DAVID J. BURRELL, D.D. [REFORMED], NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

*Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you.*—John vi. 53.

THIS is a hard saying. The natural man is not likely to apprehend it. We live on the low levels, where our eyes are dimmed with mists and our ears dulled with the roar and turmoil of sordid pursuits. It takes all the energy and ingenuity of the ordinary man to keep the wolf from the door. What wonder if heaven goes by default. The better country is a great way off. A corner lot that can be put up as collateral for present need is much rather to be desired than a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. So

long as we are in the flesh we are bound to be materialists; we want the things that our eyes can see and our hands can handle. A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.

The Jews, sitting on the mountain slopes, had been listening to Jesus as He discoursed of spiritual things. At evening He wrought the miracle of the loaves; and this was more to them than all the great invisible verities. The next day they followed Him in multitudes, and He knew the reason why. "Ye follow me not because of any spiritual longing, but because ye ate of the loaves and were filled." What they wanted was more loaves; but He gave them, instead, an electric shock. He set forth before them a great spiritual mystery, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you."

We are all alike. The cry of the Roman people, "*Pana et circenses!*" is the cry of all sordid souls. What more do we crave than something to eat and a merry day? The longings of our higher nature may be hushed, but our appetites are as voracious as the horse-leech's daughters. We can dispense with God, and character, and endless glory, but not with bread and games.

There was Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, learned, and thoughtful, and earnest; he could not grasp the thought of regeneration, one of the simplest spiritual truths. "Can a man enter again into his mother's womb and be born?" Nature is plain enough, but grace is an unfathomable depth. And there was the woman of Samaria, who was bewildered by the suggestion of the river of life. "Living water," she cried, "how can it be? The well is deep, and Thou hast nothing to draw with." And there was the young ruler, stunned and fatally repelled by the fundamental truth of self-renunciation for righteousness' sake—"Go, sell all that thou hast, and come and follow Me." He was touched on his sordid side, and the truth overwhelmed him. His shekels were a tangible fact, the heaven he longed for

was a problem; "and he went away exceeding sorrowful, for he was very rich."

We are all prone to nourish the desires of the flesh at the expense of higher things. We run after the loaves and fishes. Bread is the staff of this earthly life. No bread, no breath. In a time of great destitution the market-women of Paris surged out to Versailles and found the legislators there discussing an important question of national morals. What cared they for morals? they were hungry. A fishwoman cried out, "Cease your babbling! Come to the point! The question is, how to keep breath in the body." And that is the question for which, in one form or another, all superior considerations are forced to give way.

For there are superior considerations. We are men made in God's likeness, made to live forever. The life therefore is more than meat and the body is more than raiment. Let us break loose from the bondage of the senses. We believe in wheaten loaves because we see them and handle them and know all about them. A man went out into the fields and scattered grain; it grew into a harvest, was gathered and garnered; was carried to the mill and ground and brought home again and baked; and here it is. And if eaten and assimilated it will be changed into blood and sinew and bone. All that we know; but there is something better for us to know. God's well-beloved Son has given Himself to the earth, the millstones, and the fire that He might become our spiritual bread, the Giver and Nourisher of a spiritual and eternal life. This is our sacramental lesson, "I am that living Bread, of which if a man eat he shall never die. And except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you."

Here are three suggestions: *First*, Christianity is life. The soul that sinneth it shall die—nay, is dead. To be living in the flesh and bond-slave to the flesh is to be dead in trespasses and sins. The doctrine of total depravity is

not a dogma, but an axiom; it is not a proposition in theology, but an intuition of the race. So long as we live after the flesh the will is paralyzed, the conscience benumbed, and the heart as hard spiritually as a stone. Our Lord Jesus Christ brought life into the world. He died to bring sinners to life. He lives evermore to give life, and to give it more abundantly. The religion of Christ lifts us out of darkness and the shadow of death, and enables us to say, like our Lord Himself, "I am He that liveth, and was dead, and behold I am alive forevermore!"

We mistake when we think of Christianity as a mere system of theological and moral maxims. They say it takes two things to make a religion—to wit, a creed and a cultus. Christianity is indeed a creed; so that a man without a creed cannot be a Christian; but this creed is not a thing that you can roll up and lay among the manuscripts. It is a living thing, with eyes to see and a heart to pity and feet to go about doing good. And Christianity is also a cultus, but not a mere statute-book or litany, or illuminated missal that the dust can cover and decay gnaw at. It is a living spirit that goes everywhere, making the waste places glad, and communing with heaven and administering charity and justice among men. Come from the four winds, O breath of God's well-beloved Son, and breathe upon us all that we may live!

At this point Christianity differs from all other religions. Confucianism is proverbial philosophy. Mohammedanism is a politico-moral force. Brahminism is sacerdotal formalism. Buddhism is cold ethics. The religion of Jesus Christ comes in among these false systems and cries out, like the fishwoman at Versailles, "Cease your babbling! The question is one of life. If a man be spiritually dead, can he live again?" And it proclaims the method of resurrection, the quickening of the soul.

Observe, *second*, that the exercise of faith in Jesus Christ as our Saviour is the drawing of the first breath of this

spiritual life. This is life eternal, to know God and Jesus Christ, whom He hath sent. He that believeth in the Son hath everlasting life. To believe is to accept Christ. Faith is the hand stretched out to receive him. Christ does not save me until I can call Him my Christ. That pronoun "my" is the coupler between the soul and glory. Water in the fountain quenches no man's thirst; dip it up and drink it. I may die of starvation with a loaf in my wallet; to save me it must be eaten, assimilated, made a part of me. So must the Living Bread. Here lies the fatal defect in both morality and ceremonialism. They have no life in them. If I ever begin to live it must be by entering into vital union with Jesus Christ. Not Christ in creed, nor Christ in cultus, but Christ in us is the hope of glory. Therefore we live by faith; or if we die ultimately, we die because we have not accepted the only begotten Son of God.

And, *third*, oneness with Christ is the sustenance of the soul. As the act of faith is the drawing of the first breath, so the unceasing exercise of faith is our continued life. We must eat evermore of the living bread. To grasp the Redeemer's hand is but the beginning; we must hold fast forever. We must gather manna every morning until we are out of the wilderness. "Give us day by day our daily bread!"

We partake of Christ in practising His precepts, in copying His example, in doing His work. External piety is a vain thing.

"A man may cry, 'Church, Church,'

With no more piety than other people.

A daw's not counted a religious bird

Because it keeps a cawing in a steeple."

A mere formal Christianity is little better than none at all. God save us from an unvitalized body of doctrine or ethics. Was ever anything sadder than the wail of Heinrich Heine, who had everything in Christianity but Christ Himself? "What matters it to me that youths and maidens will crown my marble bust with laurel? I cannot bear this

fly-plaster and the smell of these wet towels. What matters it that the roses of Shiraz waft incense to me? Shiraz is two thousand miles from the Rue d'Amsterdam, where in weary loneliness I lie without comfort or hope. Oh, God's satire is heavy upon me!"

The soul must assimilate religion as the body assimilates bread, receiving it into every part of the organism and transmuting it into life. The only true godliness in the world is vital godliness; any other is ungodliness, and has the seeds of eternal death in it. This is precisely what the Lord meant when He said, "Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you."

At this sacramental table the Master calls us to a larger measure of life. Let us discern His body and His blood in these elements, and so partake of them as to enter into one with Jesus, who is our life. His flesh is meat indeed, and His blood is drink indeed. Eat, O friends; yea, drink abundantly, O well beloved; and live henceforth, having your lives hid with Christ in God.

### Waiting for God's Vindication.

By C. R. HENDERSON, D.D. [BAPTIST],  
DETROIT, MICH.

*And they shall comfort you, when ye see their ways and their doings: and ye shall know that I have not done without cause all that I have done in it, saith the Lord God.—Ezek. xiv. 23.*

THE fellow-exiles with Ezekiel complained at his threat that Jerusalem and the citizens remaining there must be made desolate for the national sins. The answer of Ezekiel is, that when the exiles see how wicked the people are and have the facts unfolded they will justify God.

I. The truths doubted.

In all ages, as in our own, men have doubted the goodness and justice of God, and have murmured at His acts. They reject consolation, and charge Jehovah with cruelty. Speak of the sufferings of Jesus for us, and the agnostic

declares that is simply another example of injustice.

#### II. Causes of scepticism.

Ask for a reason of doubt, and the rationalist asserts that pain contradicts either the goodness or the power of the Divine Being. But reasons given are not always causes. Grief is selfish, and tears blind us. Most people in trouble are like a ship directed by a careless captain and left with full canvas when the tempest bursts upon it. We sink because we are not prepared for gales. Men indulge false hopes, refuse all warnings, expect all things but death, and when the end comes they cry out that they have been wronged. Custom makes them regard a loan as a possession, and they call restoration robbery.

#### III. The futility of doubt.

Of what use is doubt of the fundamental truths of Christianity? How does it work? A sinner suffering penalty is hardened by doubt of God's justice, and discouraged from repentance by question of His mercy. A saint in agony and near to death is plunged in deeper darkness by doubt of all that remains to her. Doubt confirms a transgressor, and robs the holy of consolation. To whom then is it good?

#### IV. Comfort in God's truth.

If we could look at sin in its hideous deformity, its deep guilt, its inhuman effects, with sound vision, we would be slow to complain. If God did not punish moral evil we could not respect Him, and if He permitted wrong to go uncorrected the holy could not hope.

Haste and impatience hide truth from us. If we could see the results of suffering in character we might be consoled. History is an account of the martyrdom of man. But martyrs have not complained. They have preferred truth, beauty, goodness to the alternatives, and have not regretted the price. If Paul, Stephen, or Judson should be sent back to try the scourging of life's rod, they would choose their tortures before slothful ease and ignoble luxury. They would not change places with the pampered children of palaces. The

patriot soldiers who have fought for national independence, unity, and freedom would select death rather than any wealth if they had yet to decide their lot. In humble life examples are countless. The pearl diver sinks down a beggar and rises a prince. The son of poverty and trial plunges into toil and privation and comes forth glorified with purity and strength.

You trust a dentist, although he spreads out instruments of torture before your eyes, and you trust a surgeon, though he stretch you on a table and rob you of consciousness. Can we not confide in God and wait?

And while you wait, be not idle. There are works meet for repentance. God's winds are hard to face as "head winds," but wondrously helpful to those who will sail with them. The Divine purpose works toward correction of evil and edification of good. Build with God, and you will have naught to tear down.

The husbandman not only waits for the precious fruits of the earth, but he pulls weeds, mends fences, and tills the rows. The breath spent in idle and unjust complaints might carry penitent prayers to heaven's gate, and waft a blessing back to us.

---

#### *Glimpses of Gethsemane.*

BY REV. JOHN N. McCORMICK [M. E. SOUTH], WINCHESTER, VA.

Luke xxii. 40-46.

A VOICE seems to arrest our steps at the outermost edge of Gethsemane, saying, "Tarry ye here." All that took place under the wide-spreading branches of the ancient olives, where, in the moonlight, the Divine Sufferer knelt alone, knoweth no man even to this day. Like the lurking shadows under the trees, there are depths of mystery which no eye can penetrate. That which we can discern comes to us at best like the moonbeams through the trees, mere glimpses, gleams half veiled. Yet even with these limitations we behold a most

august spectacle. Intense suffering like death invests the most commonplace persons with an unwonted dignity and interest. The pain of even a dumb animal, the cry of a child, the uncontrolled lamentations of a savage, are worthy of respect and sympathy. Only the coarsest and lowest among us will mock at sorrow or ridicule grief. How much more sacred and impressive is the scene when the agony is that of Him who stands at the head of our humanity, the noblest, greatest, best of men! Indeed, the agony of the garden is as unique as the tragedy of the cross. The internal suffering of Christ was as different from the ordinary mental or physical suffering of men as the outward effect of His death was different from that which follows the death of other men. There is a separateness about the Christ of Gethsemane as well as about the Christ of Calvary. The sorrows and the grief of the Son of Man are adorable, not pitiable. The effort to explain the agony of Gethsemane by the ordinary physical and psychical facts which have come within the circle of our own experience, or which would have been natural to any other than Christ under the same external circumstances, is as futile as it is intrinsically absurd. Even in inquiring into such elements of His struggle as seem to be suggested by the Gospel narrative, or as would appear inseparable from His person and mission, we must keep constantly in mind our necessary restrictions and limitations.

To a reverent inquiry, What, so far as we may know, constituted the agony of Christ in the garden? the answer is, the cup which He drank was a cup of mixed ingredients. The draught of agony was extracted from many roots of bitterness.

1. If His manhood were not a mere phantom, as the early heresies would have us believe, here was the suffering of a human body and of a human soul; the inward shrinking of a highly organized and exquisitely sensitive human nature under the cumulative horrors of

His position, while over all fell the dark, cold shadow of the coming cross, now clearly perceived in the immediate future. If He were but Deity in the semblance of humanity, a godlike ghost of a man, He need not have felt the pangs of the human body and mind; if He was perfectly man, he could not but feel them.

2. But surely in this did not lie the bitterest dregs of the cup. The agony of Christ was connected directly with sin. Most of our suffering is caused by personal sin. The shuddering consciousness of inward evil, the dread of a punishment felt to be deserved, the vain regrets for the irrecoverable past, the fury-like scourgings of remorse make for us, not a Gethsemane indeed, but a Gehenna. But here was a sinless soul, as white and clean as the heart of God, oppressed by the intolerable burden of the world's evil. At last He knew that sin could not be conquered by His life and love. The sin of even the chosen people had proved itself invincible by His teaching and preaching. The lost sheep of the house of Israel, whom He had come to save, He now beheld transformed into wolves, who thirsted for the shepherd's blood. "What in other cases is only endured by the sinner, from whom God averts His holy countenance in anger, had now to be endured by Him, the pure and sinless One, because it was laid on Him by the sin of the people, and because God's hand did not interfere to turn it away from His head. He had long had a premonition of the secret of the Divine purpose of love, which, in this extremity, borne for the love of His people, prepared the last means of salvation for the people, nay, for all mankind, and which caused this Divine judgment to expiate the sin of the whole world and serve as a basis on which God could enter into a new covenant of mercy and salvation with emancipated man." This last extremity the Divine Victim now met face to face.

3. Again, the agony in the garden was an agony in the Greek meaning of

the word—a contest, a struggle. Jesus Christ, who, if language means anything, believed in a personal devil, whose Messianic preparation included a struggle in the wilderness with the spirit of evil, whose prophetic gaze beheld, as a crowning glory of His mission, Satan falling like lightning from heaven—felt, doubtless, in this hour all the infernal might of the adversary of all souls. "This," He said to His human foes, "is your hour, and the power of darkness."

It may be that other elements, of which we know nothing, were in that cup from which the human lips shrank and the soul revolted, sick even to death; who shall fully analyze the bitter, bloody wine of Gethsemane? It is enough to know that He prayed for the cup to be removed; prayed, as He had urged His disciples to pray, with importunity, until at length the inevitable answer was clearly perceived, and im-

mediately was cheerfully accepted, and He rose from His knees, master once more at all points of Himself and of the situation.

To the interior life of the Christian, Gethsemane is full of comfort. Jesus Christ knows the passion, the agony, the tragedy of life from the inside. However much His experience transcends ours, it completely covers it. He did not pass through our life serene, undisturbed, invulnerable. His brow bore the beads of the sweat of blood. He drank to the dregs the cup of tragic sorrow. In the small yet surely real Gethsemanes of our lives, when we confront the night, and the agony, and the unyielding will of God, then, as verily as He liveth, is He with us.

"Closer is He than breathing,  
Nearer than hands or feet."

For whereas an angel came to strengthen Him, He comes Himself to strengthen us.

### FOR THE PRIZE.

#### Conversion of Zacchæus.

Luke xix. 1-10.

In the incident before us Jesus is on His way to Jerusalem, where in one week from this time He is to suffer for the sins of the world. Jericho, the city which He now enters, in the time of Joshua had received a terrible curse, which was fulfilled in the time of Ahab. Now it receives the Lord of Glory Himself, and at least one home in this old city of palms and of priests receives His blessing.

It is our purpose to study the conversion of Zacchæus, noting, first, the difficulties that attended it; second, the triumph over these difficulties; and third, some of the proofs of its genuineness.

(a) His first difficulty arose from the fact that He was a publican. The publican was required to pay the Roman government a certain amount, and then

allowed to indemnify himself by exacting all he could get from the people. This led to abuse, and publican became a synonym for sinner. Therefore, even if Zacchæus had had a good character he had no reputation, for his position condemned him in the eyes of the world.

(b) The office itself was an objective difficulty; but there was also a subjective difficulty which was still harder to overcome, and that was the temptation of the office. Opportunities lay open before him for gaining wealth and position if he would only be dishonest.

(c) Then we must add, as the third difficulty, the fact that he was rich.

2. His triumph over the difficulties. In every such triumph there are always two parts. There is man's part, and there is God's part. It is man's part to place himself in Christ's way and to open his heart to receive the truth. It is God's part to seal the truth by His Spirit. Zacchæus did his part. The

record tells us that he "sought to see Jesus." Whether his action was prompted by curiosity or not, he had a receptive heart; he believed and was saved. Even if Zacchæus thought only of viewing Jesus with the physical eye, have we not a lesson for all who would behold him with the eye of faith? He who would thus behold Him must (a) overcome difficulty; (b) not allow the "crowd" to shroud His spiritual vision; and (c) improve the opportunity. Jesus never passed that way again.

3. Some of the proofs of the genuineness of His conversion:

(a) Active gratitude. No sooner had Zacchæus exercised his first act of faith than he received Jesus and welcomed Him into his home.

(b) Charity. "Lord, I give half of my goods to the poor." Not "I have been giving," but henceforth, "I shall give." Justified by faith, now the good works follow.

(c) Restitution. "I restore fourfold." We cannot have true conversion except we make right with those whom we have wronged, unless it be beyond our power to make restitution. Here are the proofs of a genuine conversion—gratitude, charity, restitution.

A READER.

### The Way to Pardon.

*Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and He will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for He will abundantly pardon.—Isa. lv. 7.*

Our text is at once a vivid portrait, an earnest exhortation, and an exceeding great and precious promise.

#### I. A VIVID PORTRAIT.

1. It introduces the man of evil deeds—"wicked." Here we behold one whose overt acts or ways violate the Divine commandment.

2. We have likewise the portrait of the man of unholy purposes—"unrighteous man his thoughts."

What a mirror the text holds up to society! All out of Christ are either unrighteous in thoughts or wicked in life. Unrighteous purposes are the source of godless deeds. So that it is sadly true of some that they are both wicked and unrighteous.

II. AN EARNEST EXHORTATION, 'Let the wicked forsake,' etc.

1. The sinner is required to forsake, to abandon his sin, whether it has assumed the outward and visible form of wicked ways, or may as yet be hidden within the secret chamber of an unholy purpose. Sin must be forsaken. We must at once, and so far as our purposes go, forever abandon the ways of sin, the thoughts of unrighteousness. How radical the demands of the Word of God are! We must part company with the very thoughts that are unrighteousness. In our relations with each other we are mainly concerned with deeds. God is concerned with our thoughts. "Our thoughts are heard in heaven." Jesus has revealed the importance of our thoughts (Mark vii. 2-23). Our thoughts are a revelation of character. "As a man thinketh in his heart," etc.

2. "Let him return unto the Lord."

The sinner lives abnormally, unnaturally. He is a prodigal away from home, a wandering sheep beyond the protection of the fold, a lost piece of silver. Hence religion is a return to God, to first relations, to natural courses of behavior. Sinners are like wandering stars escaped from their orbit. Conversion restores them to their proper place in the onward sweep of the Divine purpose.

The text is a disclosure of the nature of true repentance and of saving faith. To obey this exhortation is to exercise "repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."

III. AN EXCEEDING GREAT AND PRECIOUS PROMISE.

1. "And He will have mercy upon Him." Mercy is God's wealth. "Rich in mercy" (Titus iii. 5; Eph. ii. 6-8).

2. "Abundantly pardon." What music is in these words! We constant-



ly wrong God by our narrow views of His mercy and grace. Some of us fear that His power to save may transcend our views of His justice. Let us not so wrong Him. "There's a wideness in His mercy," etc.

This subject may be tellingly illustrated by a reference to the conversion and religious experiences of two well-known men.

Colonel James Gardiner will aptly illustrate the case of the "wicked" abundantly pardoned. Charles G. Finney's conversion is an admirable illustration of Divine mercy toward the man of unrighteous thoughts.

MONTREAL.

#### On the Death of a Believer.

*Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; and their works do follow them.—Rev. xiv. 13.*

THEY that die in the Lord are blessed, because

I. They enter into rest.

(a) Rest from labor and care.

(b) Rest from temptation. So long as man is in the world he is subject to temptation. Nor is he ever safe. If he cease for a moment to look to God he is in danger of falling. Dying in the Lord, he is eternally safe.

(c) Rest from sorrow. This is a world of sorrow; none are exempt. No life on earth is so bright that it is not mingled with disappointment and adversity.

II. They are rewarded. "Their works do follow them." All that man does in this life tells both on this life and also on the life to come.

(a) In this world the influence of the blessed dead lives on. Being dead, they yet speak.

(b) With an eternal life of joy at God's right hand. They enter into an inheritance "incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away."

C.

#### The Practical Value of the Eucharist.

*Then flew one of the seraphim unto me, having a live coal in his hand, which he had taken with the tongs from off the altar: and he laid it upon my mouth, and said, Lo, this hath touched thy lips; and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged.—Isa. vi. 6, 7.*

THE communion qualifies for service.

The object of this spiritual service is to build Christian character for spiritual usefulness.

Thus this communion

(A) *Constitutes—establishes* your Christian character for service:

1. Through the very attitude of mutual agreement here acknowledged between the disciple and his Lord at this table.

This mutual agreement is (1) to accomplish the removal of sin from our hearts; and (2) to add glory to the name and work of Christ.

This communion establishes you

2. Through *Divine help*.

3. Through the *abiding sense of union*.

This communion

(B) *Endows*; bestows permanence to personal character by gifts.

1. Temporal gifts: (1) permanence in affairs; (2) advancement of interests.

2. Spiritual gifts: the purest—all.

This communion

(C) *Modulates* your Christian character for service.

1. Brings Christian character to one certain point of perfectness—Christ,

2. Till the life, set in all its parts to one key—a heavenly melody—so continues (a) a blessed example, and (b) a blessed witness.

(D) Thus are you enabled to *sustain* your Christian character and your service for Christ.

Then, draw near to the table, for in this communion is your Christian character established, endowed, modulated, sustained for spiritual usefulness.

"VAILE."

### STRIKING THOUGHTS FROM RECENT SERMONS.

ENTHUSIASM is not the temporary fire of youth, "fire of straw soon kindled, soon burned out." It is other than fancy, more than zeal; the Greeks gave us the best meaning in calling it the divine in a man. The divine, if it is anything, is permanent. Enthusiasm is more than the aid of education, securing interest or industry, it is the power that educates. Men are made by that which they behold with gladness, admiration or reverence. Truth always gives a good bargain to all who admire her. To learn truth is one thing, to be educated by truth is another. The enthusiasm of which the boy is capable finds two forebears that chill and repress ardent emotion. One is the spirit of advanced education, the refinement of culture and discipline.—*Lamson.*

WHAT amazes me most, is that all people do not see that the entire movement at this time all over Christendom is satanic. Many of the infernal attacks are sly and hidden and strategic, and so ingenious that they are not easily discovered. But here is a bold and uncovered attempt of the powers of darkness to split up the churches, to get ministers to take each other by the throat, to make religion a laughing stock of earth and hell, to leave the Bible with no more respect or authenticity than an old almanac.—*Talmage.*

THE first duty we owe to society is to demand a higher administration of the law. In every instance of private and public financial crookedness the bottom facts should be made clear. Turn on the light, expose the guilty, but vindicate the innocent. The public leaves justice to be menaced and thwarted by bad men. How does it happen that so many great offenders go unwhipped of justice? How does it happen that the New York Boodle Aldermen are all back from Canada living on their ill-gotten gains in their old social and political haunts? How could such a disgraceful deal terminate in this disgraceful way if public opinion were up to high-water mark? What has become of the Classen-Bell syndicate of bank-breakers? Why is not the man who ruined the North River Bank tried in a court of justice? Is it not because public opinion is too lax toward the law's delays?

The result seems to be that the mania for wealth by gambling and crooked methods finds in this laxity a strong incentive, and things will go on from bad to worse till there is an earthquake of public indignation that will shake the whole country from centre to circumference. There ought to be a vigilance committee of 1000 men of acknowledged business and social probity in every large American city to see to it that the ends of justice are not defeated. An electric storm of healthful public opinion always clears up and freshens the social and political atmosphere.—*Everett.*

THE Apostle's ground of assurance that the Church is immovable in its doctrinal stability is not that it has this or that form of organization; not an office in it created and qualified to make known with certainty the Divine will; not a succession of Elders, pastors, or Bishops, transmitting an original authoritative teaching; not a Presbytery, General Assembly, Ecumenical Council, or infallible Pope, endowed with power to break the seal of a completed and closed revelation; not a creed or a confession of faith; not a document of any kind, or book, or collection of books, but this: "The Lord knoweth them that are His, and let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness."—*Prof. Smyth.*

IF we set out to swim the Charnel we take care to have a boat within hail to pick us up if we should become exhausted. To make provision for failure is, in the Christian life, to secure failure. It betrays a half-heartedness in our faith, a lurking unbelief in Christ and in His power to sustain us in life, which must bring disaster.—*Dods.*

IF life once fails to be prophetic, and its true meaning dies out of it, it all lapses into a dreary, insignificant, commonplace affair. Human life must be felt to be merely the veil of a hidden wonder, or all its power vanishes.—*Holland.*

THINK of the Gloucester printer, Robert Raikes, in 1781—a man of ordinary endowments, of ordinary position, ordinary in everything, except the priceless gift of a loving Christian heart. He saw the ragged children rioting about on Sunday in the streets of Gloucester. Hundreds of others must have noticed the same thing, but it had never even occurred to them to remedy the mischief. Convinced that crime is the daughter of ignorance, he hired four poor women to teach those children the Bible and the catechism on Sundays. I never pass his statue on the Thames Embankment without a sense of pleasure. "As I asked, Can nothing be done?" he tells us, "a voice answered, 'Try.' I did try," he says, "and see what God hath wrought." There are now Sunday-school teachers by tens of thousands all over the world, but, humanly speaking, they all owe their origin to that one word "Try," so softly whispered by some voice Divine to the loving and tender conscience of Robert Raikes a hundred years ago. The echoes of that word might be prolonged by millions of grateful children who have been taught for generation after generation by loving teachers in Sunday-schools.—*Farrar.*

THE art that sends you with reverent soul to nature, that discloses to you in unexpected places the presence of the divine, that makes of sunrise and of sunset the sacraments of God, is indeed an inspiration and a treasure. But the art that loses itself in prodigies of technical skill, perversely obtruding its own achievement and clamoring for applause, is in the strictest sense degrading and irreligious. It is not born of insight into beauty and the divine perfection, but of a desire to astonish, and to push the artist into the place of God. And even more pernicious are those forms of art in which we have an apotheosis of the vicious and base; where poet and painter employ their skill to intoxicate the senses merely; where forms of vice are made entrancing by the magic of artistic power. You who have wandered with me through the streets of Medicane Florence will never be deluded by the dream that art alone can save a commonwealth or regenerate mankind. For you saw how the surges of human passion beat about the base of Giotto's Campanile and dashed against Ghiberti's golden gates of paradise; you saw how the baleful shadow of Machiavelli's prince stalked boldly forth from out the city where Leonardo wrought his wonders and Michael Angelo fretted away his glorious soul upon the marbles that bear perpetual witness of his spiritual agony. You saw at last the liberties of Florence parish for centuries in sight of Brunelleschi's dome. But you caught also in the face of Dante glimpses of an art that leads through sorrow up to eternal beauty and the glory of God's face. Remember, therefore, that your sense of loveliness, your sensibility to all enchanting and entrancing forms, must never be estranged from Him who reared above you the starry firmament, whose power breaks to glory in the crested wave, whose voice is in the murmur of the stirring treetops, whose presence glorifies the mountain slope and holds erect the human form divine.—*Little.*

### THEMES AND TEXTS OF RECENT SERMONS.

1. Radical Remedies Dangerous. "And the servants say unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he saith, Nay; lest haply while ye gather up the tares, ye root up the wheat with them."—Matt. xiii. 28, 29. James S. Ramsay, D.D., New York City.
2. The Healing Word. "After these things there was a feast of the Jews; and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. Now, there is in Jerusalem by the sheep gate a pool, which is called in Hebrew Bethesda, having five porches," etc.—John v. 1-21. Prof. Marcus Dods, D.D., Edinburgh, Scot.
3. Christianity in Social Reforms. "The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened."—Matt. xiii. 33. Pres. Buckingham, D.D., Burlington, Vt.
4. The Christian Life Blessed and Blessing. "Freely ye have received, freely give."—Matt. x. 8. Rev. Clarence M. Eberman, Bethlehem, Pa.
5. Changing Form: Unchanging Faith. "But new wine must be put into fresh wine-skins. And no man having drunk old wine desireth new: for he saith, The old is good."—Luke v. 38, 39. Pres. L. Clark Seelye, D.D., Northampton, Mass.
6. Devotion to the Well-being of Others. "For I seek not yours, but you."—2 Cor. xiii. 14. Pres. B. P. Raymond, D.D., Middletown, Conn.
7. God's Dear Children. "Be ye therefore imitators of God, as beloved children."—Eph. v. 1. Pres. Timothy Dwight, D.D., New Haven, Conn.
8. Transient and Permanent. "For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away. But the word of the Lord endureth forever. And this is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you."—1 Pet. i. 24, 25. Lyman Abbott, D.D., Brooklyn, N. Y.
9. Unrecognized Angels. "For Manoah knew not that he was an angel of the Lord."—Judges xiii. 16. Rev. William Ewen, B.D., Glasgow, Scot.
10. The Cry for Certainty. "And it was at Jerusalem the feast of the dedication, and it was winter. And Jesus walked in the Temple in Solomon's porch. Then came the Jews round about Him and said unto Him, How long dost Thou make us to doubt? If Thou be the Christ, tell us plainly."—John x. 22-24. Canon H. Scott Holland, London, Eng.
11. The Heir of All Things. "His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things."—Heb. i. 2. Prof. Henry Calderwood, D.D., L.L.D., Edinburgh, Scot.
12. The Emancipating Power of Truth. "The truth shall make you free."—John viii. 32. Joseph S. Stone, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa.
13. Delusions of Unrighteousness. "How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger?"—Luke xv. 17. F. W. Gunsaulus, D.D., Chicago, Ill.
14. What Constitutes Public Worship? "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve."—Matt. iv. 10. Rev. O. Heber, Annapolis, O.
15. The Indestructibility of the Kingdom of Christ. "It shall stand forever."—Dan. ii. 44. J. M. Buckley, D.D., Nashville, Tenn.
16. Well-doing and Evil-doing, their Results in the Present Life. "Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart and in the sight of thine eyes; but know thou that for all these things God will bring thee into judgment."—Ecc. xi. 9. Pres. Harrison E. Webster, D.D., Schenectady, N. Y.

### Suggestive Themes for Pulpit Treatment.

1. Two Annunciations. ("And the angel of the Lord said unto her, Behold thou . . . shalt bear a son; and thou shalt call his name Ishmael, because the Lord hath heard thy affliction. And he shall be as a wild-ass among men; his hand shall be against every man, and every man's hand against him."—Gen. xvi. 11, 12. "And the angel said unto her, . . . Behold, thou shalt bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High; and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David. . . . And of his kingdom there shall be no end."—Luke i. 30-33.)
2. The Antidote to Anarchy. ("Nurture them in the chastening and admonition of the Lord."—Eph. vi. 4.)
3. The Exclusiveness of Faith. ("Though we or an angel from heaven should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema."—Gal. i. 8.)
4. Whence and Whither. ("Whence comest thou? and whither goest thou?"—Gen. xvi. 8.)
5. Christ's Prohibition of Bigotry. ("Forbid him not, for he that is not against you is for you."—Luke ix. 50.)
6. The Right to Childhood. ("But as many as received Him, to them gave He the right to become children of God. Even to them that believe on His name."—John i. 12.)
7. A Transformed Curse. ("They met not the children of Israel with bread and with water, but hired Balaam against them to curse them; howbeit our God turned the curse into a blessing."—Neh. xiii. 2.)
8. Spiritual Destitution. ("I heard thy voice in the garden and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself."—Gen. iii. 10.)
9. The Effusiveness of Treachery. ("He asked water and she gave him milk; she brought him butter in a lordly dish. She put her hand to the nail, and her right hand to the workmen's hammer; and with the hammer she smote Sisera, she smote through his head, yea, she pierced and struck through his temples."—Judges v. 25, 26. "And straightway he came to Jesus and said, Hail, Rabbi; and kissed him."—Matt. xxvi. 49.)

10. The Advocate of the Poor. ("Rob not the poor, because he is poor, neither oppress the afflicted in the gate: for the Lord will plead their cause, and despoil of life those that despoil them."—Prov. xxii. 22, 23.)
11. Intemperance the Cause of Poverty. ("Who hath complaining? . . . They that tarry long at the wine; they that go to seek out mixed wine."—Prov. xxiii. 29, 30.)
12. The Ante-pentecostal Gift of the Spirit. ("Thou gavest also thy good spirit to instruct them."—Neh. ix. 20.)
13. The Definite Rule of Uncertainty. ("He that doubteth is condemned if he eat, be-  
cause he eateth not of faith; and whatsoever is not of faith is sin."—Rom. xiv. 23.)
14. A Natural Sequence of Communism. ("Now in these days, when the number of the disciples was multiplying, there arose a murmuring of the Grecian Jews against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations."—Acts vi. 1.)
15. A Vicarious Blush. ("O my God, I am ashamed and blush to lift up my face to Thee, my God; for our iniquities are increased over our head, and our guiltiness is grown up unto the heavens."—Ezra ix. 6.)

## HELPS AND HINTS, TEXTUAL AND TOPICAL.

BY ARTHUR T. PIERSON, D.D.

### The Divine Jealousy.

*For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God.*—Exodus xx. 5.

This is one of the stumbling-blocks to the thoughtless reader. Jealousy is the rage of a man, a mean, malicious passion, unreasonable in suspicion and unrestrained in vindictiveness. Applied to God, jealousy is a divine principle; it is a holy insistence upon the supremacy of God in the affections, obedience and worship of His creatures, and an equally holy resistance toward all that divides the allegiance of His people. So far from being a blemish, such jealousy is a perfection necessary to the divine character, without which Jehovah could not be God. The subject may be illustrated and applied in four directions—Law, Worship, Service, and Love.

I. LAW. It is significant that the first intimation of the divine jealousy is found in the Decalogue. God jealously guards His law. He is the divine Law-maker. The word Lord is a contraction of law-ward, or guardian of law. He has a right to command, and that right is supreme. In the nature of the case there can be but one Supreme Law-giver, and He can tolerate no rival in His government.

He indicates here how He shows His jealousy of His law, by the stern exaction of penalty *in judgment*. He visits

the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, etc. Law is nothing without its sanctions, which are the pillars which support its arch. God severely exacts penalty. No transgressor escapes the just judgment of God. And inasmuch as there is an organic unity in the family and the race, the effects of sin are felt unto the third and fourth generation. Here comes in the law of heredity. It was designed as a channel of blessing, but sin turned it into a channel of curse. Even now to the obedient it is still a channel of blessing, and grace exceeds justice; for while judgment reaches the third and fourth generation, mercy reaches the thousandth. (Deut. vii. 9.)

II. WORSHIP. This is *worth-ship*, or the ascribing of worth to God. He is the Supreme Being, and to worship Him is to exalt Him to the first place. Hence, again, worship demands undivided homage. In the nature of the case God can permit no rival. He alone must be exalted. Here, again, let us notice that the first declaration of the divine jealousy is in connection with the law of worship. The second command forbids all approach to God through the medium of graven images or visible representations of God. Why? Not because these are always meant as other gods. It is noticeable that the second command does not cover the same ground as the first. That forbids all other deities beside Jehovah; and this

forbids our approach to Him, as the one God, by means of any similitude. And for the reason that what at first may be meant as a symbol or expression of the one God, in time comes to be an object of worship, drawing the thought of the worshipper to *itself*, and thus becoming an idol. Compare the history of calf-worship in Hebrew history, and images and pictures in the Romish Church.

Here, again, transgression has its penalty: it is the *withdrawal of God's Spirit* from His courts. The penalty with poetic exactness corresponds to the offence. God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth. So far as this is done, He meets the worshipper with His spiritual presence and power. But when and so far as the spirituality of worship is invaded by visible forms or representations of God, He leaves the worshipper to his own devices, and the spirit forsakes His courts—as the shekinah cloud withdrew from the tabernacle and temple when idols were there set up.

III. SERVICE. Here, again, the Lord must stand alone. No man can serve two masters. If they are antagonistic, they oppose each other; and even if not mutually hostile, they would divide the obedience of the servant. God demands *all* the service we can render. In law the transference of property is vitiated by a single reservation. God will have all or none. As a fact, there is no other claimant for our service that is not entirely hostile to God. The world, the flesh, the devil, mammon, self, are implacable foes of God. The world draws us by the power of the present, God by the power of the future; the flesh emphasizes the sensuous and sensual, God, the spiritual and invisible; the devil draws to sin, God to holiness; self sets up our own will, God would teach us to accept His will as our own.

Here, again, transgression has its penalty—*Rejection* of proffered service. God says to all such, "I know you not;" of all divided allegiance and obedience He says, "I will not have it."

And the moment we attempt this im-

possibility, we lose all sense of fellowship and harmony with God.

IV. LOVE. Jealousy is especially connected in our minds with the passion of marital love, which by its nature can admit no rival. God made one man for one woman. Polygamy is a perversion of the original law. A rival being admitted, love is, *ipso facto*, destroyed. It can no longer exist in purity and virtuous exercise. Even a *look* may violate its sanctity.

Now God is pleased throughout the Bible to illustrate His peculiar relation to His people by the marriage tie. Prophets, psalmists, evangelists, and epistle writers—all present God as the husband or bridegroom and the body of believers as the wife or bride; and all divided love is treated as adultery. This key unlocks some of the most beautiful mysteries of the Bible. Comp. Song of Solomon, where the maiden, affianced to a humble shepherd, refuses to be turned from him by all the charms of an imperial harem. Also Eph. v., etc. This explains an obscure passage in James iii. 4, 5. If we translate verse 5, "The spirit that dwelleth in us jealously desireth us"—that is, *wholly for Himself*, we have the Spirit of God represented as, with a divine jealousy, yearning for the undivided love of the saints.

Here, again, all invasion of the divine claim has its penalty, and it is *chastisement*. When Israel thus turned from Jehovah, captivity to the foes of God and His people was the appropriate penalty. God, for the time, abandoned them to their newly chosen alliance and affianced, and brought back the treacherous wife to her husband by severe strokes of His rod. And so now there is much needless chastisement. If we would not wander, we should not require such discipline. Comp. 1 Cor. xi. 31, 32.

#### "Falling."

THE Bible abounds in nice distinctions. Take, for example, the falling of the sinner and the falling of the saint. What a difference between choosing a

wrong way and pursuing it, so as to become farther and farther alienated from God and goodness; and choosing a right way, and stumbling or even falling at times, only to rise and keep on pursuing the path to holiness and heaven! There is a grand difference between even the most perfect quartz crystal and the most imperfect diamond. The tidal wind and wave often appear to reverse the flow of a stream, when in fact it is only the superficial wave that moves contrary to the steady current. Peter denied Christ thrice, and with oaths and curses; but as soon as the stress of the great temptation was over he went out and wept most bitterly, and henceforth, taught by his lapse into sin, not only stood from before temptation, but strengthened his brethren. Judas fell by the sin of betrayal into a deeper gulf of hopeless remorse that led to suicide. For him, without doubt, as for Peter, there would have been forgiveness had he sought it; but he had not the instincts of a saint. His fall was not a stumble in the right way, but a new and deeper plunge into the abyss of sin from which he had never been really rescued. Peter gravitated toward God, but for a time his advance was interrupted and arrested. Judas gravitated toward sin, and his advance was simply accelerated; he had never yet changed the direction of his life, though his progress in sinning may have been for a time arrested by the outward association with the son of God and fellowship with His disciples.

#### The Understanding of Scripture.

How much of our so-called inability to understand the Word of God may at bottom be resolved into a simple unwillingness or unreadiness to receive its plain statements. Comp. Mark ix. 31, 32. "For He taught His disciples and said unto them: The Son of Man is delivered into the hands of men, and they shall kill Him; and after that He is killed He shall rise the third day." Nothing can be couched in plainer

terms. Christ plainly foretold them, immediately before the event, that He would be delivered into the hands of men, that they would kill Him, and that He would rise the third day afterward. And yet it is immediately and significantly added, "*But they understood not that saying.*" Why not? Manifestly not because of any obscurity in the saying, but because of the blinding influence of prejudice and prepossession. They were not ready to accept plain teaching. The obscurity was within. In the twilight, not to say the midnight, the plainest writing is illegible. And if in the mind there be a prejudice against a doctrine or a prepossession in favor of a certain teaching, it blinds us to the real doctrine there taught, or the fact that what we put there is not there. We need a perfectly docile mind, and to him that is willing to learn, truth becomes exceedingly simple and plain. The Bible means what it says. There is less risk in accepting in every case its obvious teaching than in attempting to interpret it according to our preconception. The baldest literalism involves less peril than the absurd spiritualizing often attempted to get rid of literal meaning.

#### Salvation.

SALVATION is a term used in Scripture with more than one meaning. It has at least two. First it means an immediate deliverance from condemnation—from the overhanging penalty of sin—by simple repentance and faith. But there is another and higher meaning not to be overlooked—namely, the *ultimate deliverance* from the power and even presence of sin, when the complete work of Christ in the soul, as well as for the soul, is manifested. In this sense salvation is not an act of grace only, but a work gradually carried on to perfection. Hence Philippians ii. 12, 13, where we are told to work out (*i.e.*, to the end, as a finished work) our own salvation, while God worketh in us both to will and to do. Peter, in his first

Epistle i. 5, 9, 10, uses the word in the same sense—a salvation reserved in heaven, and ready to be revealed in the last time. In chapter ii. 2 he exhorts us as new-born babes, to grow *unto full salvation* by the milk of the Word (Revised Version).

It would appear that Paul uses the phrase in some such sense in Romans x. 9, 10. Confession with the mouth certainly is not elsewhere taught as a condition of salvation. But if we take salvation in its larger sense of complete and ultimate perfection of holy life, it is true and very significant. Paul says that with the heart man believeth unto righteousness or *justification*; and with the mouth confession is made unto *salvation*. Salvation is here something more than simple deliverance from condemnation, it is saving unto sanctification and service. Paul proceeds to outline the grand apostolic succession—of faith, testimony, hearing, believing, etc. This is God's plan for the evangelization of the world—that every man who hears and believes shall confess, and so enable others to hear, believe, and confess. The Gospel message heard with the ear, received in the heart, must find its way from heart to lip, from lip to the ear, and so to another heart, and lip, until every soul shall have heard. Now, if you who believe do not confess, you break God's circle; you interrupt the divine succession and hinder God's plan. After you believe, and believing receive salvation, you are to set before you a higher salvation and work it out to the end. You are to become a *witness* for God, and so a savior of souls, a link in the chain by which all men are to be ultimately made hearers if not believers. What a lesson on missions!

#### Seven Aspects of Substitution.

CHRIST is the God appointed substitute (Rom. v. 8); secondly, Christ is the God approved substitute (Heb. ii. 9); thirdly, Christ as our substitute has given perfect satisfaction to divine jus-

tice on account of sin (2 Cor. v. 21); fourthly, Christ as our substitute protects from divine wrath (1 Cor. v. 7; Ex. xii. 13); fifthly, Christ as our substitute placed us in an unparalleled position; sixthly, Christ as our substitute has procured unlimited blessing (Rom. viii. 32); and seventhly, Christ as our substitute had a practical end in view in thus acting in our behalf (Titus ii. 14).—*Rev. F. E. Marsh.*

#### Eloquence.

GLADSTONE defines eloquence as "the pouring back upon an audience in a flood of that which has been first received from them in vapor." We greatly need a monograph which shall set forth the true contribution of a hearer to the eloquence of the pulpit.

#### Voice of the Spirit.

ELIJAH was unmoved by the earthquake, the fire, and the stormy wind; but when he heard the still small voice, he came out of his seclusion and stood at the entering in of the cave. The still small voice represents the work of the Holy Spirit; and it is indeed a still small voice, easily quenched by the clamor of carnal appetite, worldly ambition, and selfish indulgence, but if devoutly listened to, it begets an unbroken calm, and is plain, and distinct, and all-controlling.

#### The World and Disciples.

OUR blessed Lord says: "If ye were of the world, the world would love his own," and the intercessory prayer tells us the true relation of the disciple to the world. He is in the world; he is not of the world; he is chosen out of the world; but he is sent back into the world to be a witness for his Master and Lord.

#### Truth.

ARISTOTLE has defined truth "what a thing is in itself, in its relations, and in

the medium through which it is viewed." The last condition is a very important one. Goethe says: "When one is reading a writing, it behoves him to see to it that all is clear within. In the twilight, even a clear writing is illegible. What people think to be spots in the sun may really be a cataract in the eye, or a speck on the eyeballs or on the lens of the telescope.

#### God's Oversight.

"Touch not Mine anointed and do My prophets no harm." I have just

heard related, by one who knew all the circumstances, the story of a plot to supplant a most godly minister and drive him out of his church, simply because of the infirmities of a growing age. It was arranged that a conspicuous member of the congregation should, at the close of a morning sermon, rise, and by the power of persuasive utterances, take steps to turn this earnest and godly man adrift. On the very morning when the plot was to have been executed, the main mover in it, without a moment's warning, was called to his account, and the plot fell through.

### THE PRAYER-MEETING SERVICE.

By WAYLAND HOYT, D.D.

SEPT. 1-5. — CHRIST THE KING. — Matt. xxi. 5.

The Jewish Sabbath—our Saturday—is over. It is the day of the week which we call Sunday, and all the pathways leading to Jerusalem are thronged with pilgrims toward the Passover. Bethany has been a Sabbath resting-place for many others as well as for Jesus. Out from Jerusalem, too, many have come attracted to Bethany by the fame of the Great Teacher. So Jesus becomes at once the centre of an accumulating crowd.

And, just now, there is a difference in the action of Jesus. Before, when the multitude would crown Him, He sent them away. Now He will show forth His essential Kinghood.

Bethphage is the next village lying under the southeast slope of the Mount of Olives. From thence the Lord commands two of His disciples to bring an ass's colt. Then, upon the colt unbroken, with the outer garments of the disciples thrown across for saddle, Jesus is seated. Moving onward in this simplicity of pomp, enthusiasm kindles through the multitude. They break forth in praises—"Blessed be the *King* that cometh in the name of the Lord." They make a carpet with their gar-

ments for His beast to tread on. They climb the trees and cut off branches and strew them upon the road; they would have nature share the swelling praise and joy. Though they may not think it, they are fulfilling an old prophecy (Zech. ix. 9). There on the slope of Olivet, where the wonderful Jerusalem bursts upon the vision, Jesus waits to weep over it and to utter His tender lament about the destruction darkening its future. But His tears do not damp the praises of the multitudes; still the songs are sung; still sound the praises forth. And when Jesus, with the multitude before and after, passes down to the Kedron and over that little brook and up the steep acclivity to the city gate, the sudden entrance of such a large and excited crowd compels a great commotion throughout Jerusalem. People hurry to meet it, and so add to it. The wave of the procession moving into the city meets a counter wave flowing toward it. "Who is this?" cry a part. "This is Jesus, the prophet from Nazareth of Galilee," answer the others. So crowd on the multitude. So swell on the praises through the Temple-gates.

Certainly that which stands loftily out of this whole scene is the truth of



*Christ's Kingship.* Here throughout this triumphal entry Christ assents to kingly praises and asserts His Kingship. "Behold thy King cometh unto thee," is the prophecy of which this triumphal entry is the fulfilment.

Now it is most interesting and noteworthy how the entire drapery of this majestic scene sets forth, as in exact symbol, the kind of royalty He wears. Christ is King, but He is unique King. His is royalty such as the world had never seen before.

1. Christ is no King *in the way of external worldly splendor.*

"It is said that after the Czar of Russia had been crowned, and came forth from the Kremlin, wearing the great imperial diadem, which is one mass of diamonds of matchless magnificence, and with his robe covered with the embroidered jewelry of Muscovy, he stood in the portal of the cathedral while the sun was shining in its noonday strength, and so extraordinary was the brightness of this apparition of earthly glory, radiant from head to foot with the profusion of rubies, emeralds, and sapphires, that the whole of the Russian multitude fell awestruck to the ground before that which seemed to them an image of perfect happiness and of boundless power." But not such splendor is our Lord's.

2. Nor is Christ King in the way of *external and hard force.* Cæsar is such a king. But no such king as he, bristling and pitiless with external force, is Christ.

Mark to what that triumphal entry tends, and you shall learn the sort of Kingship which Jesus wields. The bright gates of that triumphal entry open indeed toward glory; but toward the Glory of the Cross. And the Cross means utmost and self-sacrificing Love. Christ is King in the *inner realm of human hearts.* For in answer to His Love human love clasps Him and devotion waits on Him, and worship adores Him. Christ is the loving King and His Kingdom is the Kingdom of love.

(a) Then if He be rightfully thus King in human hearts, gathering to Himself all that is best in them and most precious in them, *Christ must be Divine.* For if Christ be not Divine, then the heart which yields to Christ such love and loyalty has nothing left for God. And if Christ accept such supreme love and be not God He is—of impostors the worst. Necessarily Christ's Kingship means Christ's Divinity.

(b) If Christ be King in human hearts, and if He be thus lifted to the Throne of human hearts by Love, then the only thing left for those over whom He rules is *unqualified Obedience.* Obedience is forevermore the test and fruit of love.

(c) If Christ be thus King, then Christianity must be *Righteousness*; it must mean the severest ethics.

"I only speak from my own experience; I know what I am saying; I can point out the times and places when I should have fallen, and should not have been able to do right if I had only trusted for guidance on nothing better than commandments or than principle; but the pure, calm, heroic figure of Jesus Christ confronted me in my thoughts, and I succeeded. I had no doubt what Christ would have done, and, through Him, I did not doubt what I ought to do."

(d) If Christ be thus King, *then all things in this world exist for Him and for His Kingdom.* "The Lord hath need of them"—in that act and answer about the ass and her foal I find illustration of the great law striking through the world that all things exist for Christ.

(e) Since Christ is such a King, see *how slight a thing* our King will accept as service in His Kingdom. They are but a peasant multitude. They have not much to give—only their dust-stained raiment, only the branches of the trees. But these the King does not disdain.

(f) Since Christ is such a King, *He cannot appear and not thrust men into*

*decision concerning Himself.* The whole city is in commotion. Some accept him. Scribes and Pharisees plot for His ruin. The entering Christ necessarily divides the throng into two classes. There can be no middle ground. For Him or against Him; within His Kingdom or outside of it.

SEPT. 7-12.—PERSONAL CONSECRATION TO THE PERSONAL CHRIST.—John vi. 37.

Most wonderful and noteworthy is the way in which Christ is always speaking of Himself. "While He is the least self-conscious of teachers, He is of all teachers the most conscious of Himself; while the least egotistical, the most concerned with His own Person."

Never such sublime daring as in Christ. If He be what He claims to be—Divine—such daring is right and reasonable. If He be not Divine, such daring is foolish and His own utter stultification. Think of the multitudinous things Christ calls Himself, setting Himself forth as the alone and sufficient supply for the vast and various hunger of human souls. Christ declares Himself to be—the Bread of life; the Light of the world; the Good Shepherd; the Truth; the Giver of Rest; the Vision of the Father, etc.

Over against every spiritual want Christ stands saying—I fill it: I Myself—not a doctrine, not a rite, not a church; I Myself.

So in our Scripture, there is the same uplifting of His own Personality—Him that cometh unto *Me*. This, then, is the teaching of our Scripture—*Christ calls men to the personal consecration of the personal self to the Personal Christ as life's chief Duty.*

*First.* By such call Christ answers the deepest want of our human hearts. As flowers cry for sunlight our hearts cry for persons. How sad this plaint of one who has bereaved himself of the idea of a personal God!

"No one can have a more lively perception than myself of the possibly disastrous tendency of my work. With this virtual negation of God the universe has lost its soul of loveliness. When at times I think, as think at times I must, of the appalling contrast between the hallowed glory of that creed which once was mine, and the lonely mystery of existence as now I find it, at such times I shall ever feel it impossible to avoid the sharpest pangs of which my nature is susceptible."

What we want for trust and help is a personality. "There may be principles for the intellect, but there must be persons for the heart." Every great cause or principle to be successful has incarnated itself in a person. The glory of France found incarnation in the first Napoleon. The sacredness of our Union found incarnation in Abraham Lincoln. The truth of justification by faith could not make headway till it got itself incarnated in the person, Martin Luther. Now Christ says, "In religion this is what you need, *Me*, the Person. There is personal Divine love for you—behold it in *Me*; there is personal Divine sympathy for you—behold it in *Me*; there is personal Divine care for you—behold it in *Me*."

*Second.* By this call to the personal consecration of the personal self to the personal Christ, our Lord opens the way out of doubt and perplexity. After all, religion is a simple thing; fundamentally it is only the personal following of the personal Christ. How this clew threads labyrinths; decides questions of difficult duty; is the standard by which pleasures are to be tested.

*Third.* By such call Christ makes the true life possible. But let one say what another has said, and as inevitably as the day comes from the year the true life must issue. "My hand, my foot, my eye, my ear, my tongue, my understanding, my heart—all that is within me belong to the Lord and are to be used according to His loving and holy will. My hand is His, redeemed by Him, sacred to Him, and cannot do

unholy work ; my foot is His, and cannot go on unholy errands ; my ear is His, and cannot listen to unholy words ; my eye is His, and cannot look upon unholy deeds ; my tongue is His, and cannot utter unholy speeches ; my mind is His, and cannot willingly think unholy thoughts ; my heart is His, and cannot cherish unholy feelings and desires ; my whole being is His, redeemed by Him, sacred to Him, and is surrendered to His will."

SEPT. 14-19.—LET THIS MIND BE IN YOU.\*—Phil. ii. 5.

It was not so wonderful that a baby should be born. Since Adam's first-born the mystery of birth had been steadily re-enacted.

Nor was it so uncommon that a babe should be born into poverty and find a manger for a cradle. Dr. Thompson, so long a missionary in Palestine, tells us "it is common to find two sides of the one room where the native farmer resides, with his cattle, fitted up with these mangers and the remainder elevated about two feet higher for the accommodation of the family. The mangers are built of small stones and mortar, in the shape of a box or rather of a kneading trough, and when cleaned up and whitewashed, as they often are in summer, they do very well to lay little babes in. Indeed, our own children have slept there in our rude summer retreats on the mountains."

Nor was it such an unusual thing that this life, beginning here in this manger at Bethlehem, as it grew on into childhood and strengthened into youthhood and developed into manhood should be smitten with much sorrow. Sorrow has been the heritage of the race.

Nor was it an experience altogether so unique that this life, beginning here in Bethlehem, should end on a cross

\* I have used in this study portions of material I have formerly used in a little book of mine—"The Brook in the Way"—in the chapter The True Ideal for Life.

and by it. Crosses were by no means uncommon in those days.

And yet there never was a birth or life or death so utterly unique, so stupendously uncommon, so separate in its infinite wonder, as the birth which occurred on that night in Bethlehem, as the life which flowed out of it, as the death which found its consummation on that cross.

And if you ask the reason for the infinite separateness between this and every other birth or life or death which had ever been or can ever be again, these verses, in some respects the most wonderful in the whole Scripture, shall declare the reason to you.

"Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus, who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God—that is, deemed not His equality with God a thing to grasp at—but emptied Himself, taking upon Him the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men ; and, being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, becoming obedient even unto death, and that the death of the cross."

It was because that birth was the birth of one equal with Jehovah, yet who did not grasp at such equality ; it was because that life was a life stooping from the throne of the Highest to share the sorrow which belonged to men, that thus it might become touched with all the feelings of our infirmities ; it was because that death was a death to which the Only-begotten Son humbled Himself, in order that tasting death for every man, men might be delivered from it—it is this which makes that birth and life and death so unique and singular.

The Creator descended into creaturehood there in Bethlehem. The King became the servant.

And the mainspring of such sacrifice the apostle discloses in another place : "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though He was rich yet for your sakes He became poor, that ye through His poverty might be-

come rich." *For our sakes.* These are the words which sounding over the abysmal sacrifice of that birth and life and death explain them all. The love of self in Deity was nothing; the love of others, everything.

And it is this mind of self-sacrificing love Christians are to have. Therefore

(a) The Christian must seek to be unselfish. The mind which is to be in Christians and selfishness are precisely antagonistic.

(b) The Christian should give *himself* in help toward others, even as Christ gave Himself. There are two ways of giving help: where help is simply flung off; where the sympathetic self goes with the help. This last should be the Christian's way of help. Christ did not remain in Heaven and thunder down to us. He became brother with us.

(c) The Christian should be *patient* in his helping, even as Christ was. Here is a truth for tired Sunday-school teachers, etc.

And the way to gain this mind of Christ, which should be in us, is

(a) To determine toward the having it;

(b) To pray for it;

(c) To steadily *practise* toward it. He has "this mind" most who most does as such mind prompts!

---

SEPT. 21-26.—PEACE.—JOHN XIV. 27.

Such legacy the Lord would leave His disciples. Let us seek to get hint of this most precious heirship, as our Lord Himself illustrates what He would entail on His disciples.

(A) It is the *Peace of Submission*. Consider what so frequently shatters Peace.

(a) Circumstances; no man is placed *exactly* as he would like to be.

(b) Temptations; temptations are as various as inward constitutions and outward surroundings.

(c) Overwhelming trials. You have a little shoe pressed into such dainty shape by the little foot; some clothes;

some childish toys laid carefully away, and a little sodded mound—and that is all.

(d) Some great care.

You cannot find peace by a *useless questioning* as to why things are so.

Nor can you find peace by a *useless brooding* over your sorrow. I knew a man once who built a monastery out of his sorrow and went into it, just as a monk enters a real monastery. He, to a great extent, lost interest in life; withdrew himself from duty; gave himself to brooding. He never found *peace* thus.

But now the Master's peace was a peace flowing from *submission*. If any one had hostile circumstances about himself Christ had; if ever one was confronted with difficulty Christ was; if ever one was overburdened, or tempted, or harassed, or wrapped about by darkening sorrow Christ was. Yet amid all there was the constancy of peace, because He was always saying, "Even so, Father, for so it seemeth good in Thy sight."

(B) The Master's peace was a peace of *achievement*. A genuine peace is not a peace of simple acquiescence, nor can it *altogether* flow from a mere submission. Just here is a frequent mistake. People identify a genuine religious peace with a nerveless submission, with a kind of religious languor and relaxation. They seek, in a religious way, to throw themselves upon life as a bit of flabby seaweed throw itself upon the water, to be dashed and drifted hither and thither as the winds and tides may choose. "One of our most insidious temptations is to mistake a comfortable deadening of aspiration for Christian assurance; and of the two possible sorts of satisfaction, raising the soul toward God or quenching its nobler desires, accepting the last." But such was not the Master's peace. "My peace," said the Master. It was a peace peculiar. It was the peace which crowns accepted and accomplished duty. It was a peace which came through taunts, poverties bravely

borne, through the facing and the vanquishing of iron obstacles, through the blood-drenched Gethsemane, through the Cross. There was the most stringent positivity in the Master's peace. It was an achievement. It was something won. *Corona e cruce*—out of the cross the crown.

(C) It was the peace of constant and

conscious oneness with the Father. And through our Lord's atonement we may enter into oneness with God, and so into the deep and inner peace which spreads its calm when the soul, reconciled with God, can say, as Christ has made it possible for the believing soul to say with Him, our elder Brother, Abba, dear Father.

## EXEGETICAL AND EXPOSITORY SECTION.

### Studies in the Psalter.

By TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D.

NO. XXXIII.—THE 36TH PSALM.

*A Sharp Contrast of Sin and Holiness.*

THIS psalm, like the 18th, is described in the title as *By a servant of Jehovah. By David*, which seems to imply a peculiar significance, possibly in contrast with the "oracle" mentioned in the first verse. The abrupt transition made in the fifth verse led Hupfeld, and afterward Cheney, to the conjecture (for it can be nothing more) that here are parts of two different psalms that have come together by accident or mistake. Such a rash conclusion here, as elsewhere, is due to a lack of poetic sensibility or incapacity to understand the workings of a pious heart, as will be seen when we come to consider the transition. The psalm is not to be assigned to any particular occasion in the life of its author or any definite period in Jewish history. Its structure is very regular. First is a vigorous description of human depravity (vv. 1-4). Then follows a striking picture of the Divine excellence (vv. 5-9). In the conclusion the writer prays to be delivered from the first and made a partaker of the second, ending with a strong assurance of success.

I. *The Character of the Wicked* (vv. 1, 2).

Sin's oracle possesseth the wicked in his heart ;  
There is no fear of God before his eyes ;  
For it flattereth him in his own eyes,

As to his iniquity being found out and hated.  
The words of his mouth are iniquity and deceit ;  
He hath left off to act wisely and well.

Wickedness doth he devise upon his bed ;  
He taketh his stand upon a way not good ;  
He abhorreth not evil.

The opening verse is one of the most obscure and difficult in the whole psalter. Most expositors assume a textual error in the suffix of the word *heart*, and (with several ancient versions) change *my* into *his*, since it seems impossible to conceive that the oracle of personified sin should be addressing the wicked in the heart of the psalmist. The word rendered *oracle* is constantly used as a formula of prophetic or inspired utterance, and its application here to sin represents the latter as uttering an authoritative dictum to which the wicked man renders obedience as if it were a voice from the unseen world. Hence there is no fear of God before his eyes. In the next verse (which is also very difficult of interpretation, owing to its obscure brevity) the seductive influence of the inward oracle is further set forth in that it flatters him with the notion that his iniquity will not be detected and punished. Thus the character of the wicked man is said to show itself in his heart, in his lips, and in the work of his hands. There is a constant progress in his evil course. He has left off even the appearance of correct action. During the hours intended for sleep he spends the time in meditating evil. He resolutely takes his stand upon ways which, it is said, are "not good"—*i.e.*, as the *meiosis* means\*

\* Just as in ordinary parlance to say of a man that he is "no saint" means that he is very far from being one.

are extremely bad. His moral sense is so impaired that, instead of renouncing evil, he does it without repugnance or misgiving.

There is something very striking in the sentiment that depravity is the sinner's oracle. Its impulses come to him like those responses from superhuman sources which command the reverence and obedience of mankind. He yields to the seductive influence, and presses forward in the delusion that he will never be found out. And so, the fear of punishment being dispelled, he becomes thoroughly bad in heart, speech, and behavior. He is deliberate in evil doing. Even in retirement, apart from external surroundings, he concocts schemes of sin, and surrenders himself to every depraved impulse. A dreadful picture, yet one as true as it is dreadful.

## II. *The Divine Excellence* (vv. 5-9).

O Jehovah, in the heavens is Thy loving-kindness,

Thy faithfulness reaches the clouds.  
Thy righteousness is like the mountains of God,  
Thy judgments are a great deep;

Man and beast Thou dost preserve, Jehovah.  
How precious is Thy loving-kindness, O God!  
That the sons of men find refuge in the shadow of Thy wings.

They are sated with the abundance of Thy house,  
And Thou makest them drink of the stream of Thy pleasures;

For with Thee is the fountain of life,  
And in Thy light do we see light.

The sudden transition here has struck some as forced. But, as Dr. DeWitt justly says, "Surely nothing is more natural than that the eye that has become wearied by the contemplation of evil in its shocking details should be lifted for relief to the transcendent excellency of God." In truth, the one theme is a natural as well as a poetical recoil of feeling from the other. Where else can a devout mind find relief from the hideous sight of human wickedness than in the thought of God's faithfulness and goodness? The psalmist begins with Jehovah's loving-kindness and His faithfulness—*i.e.*, His fulfillment of promises, even to the undeserving. These fill the earth and reach up

to heaven. They transcend all human thought and desire (Eph. iii. 18), and the universe itself is too little to set forth their greatness. Jehovah's righteousness—*i.e.*, His rectitude in general, is compared to the mountains of God, mountains which, being produced by Almighty power, are a natural emblem of immensity. Judgments, on the other hand—that is, particular acts of righteousness—are likened to the great deep in its vastness and mystery. "How unsearchable are His judgments" (Rom. xi. 33)! Thus the mightiest things in all creation, whether in the height above or in the depths beneath, are chosen as appropriate figures of the Divine perfections. The next clause shows one of the most touching characteristics of Hebrew poetry in the instantaneous transition from the consideration of God's unapproachable excellence to that of His providential care, which extends to every living thing, rational or irrational (cf. Pss. civ., cxlv. 13-16). The animal world is closely bound up with man's joy and his sorrow. The thought of these things makes the singer burst forth in devout rapture: "How precious is Thy loving-kindness!" It is valuable beyond all treasures, since it affords such a sure and ample protection for all who take refuge beneath Jehovah's outstretched wings (Ruth ii. 12). In the enlargement of this thought God is represented as a gracious host who provides for all who come to His house and His table (cf. Pss. xxiii. 5, xxxiv. 9). They are sated with the richest food, and drink of the stream of God's pleasures or "Edens" (as the original means), a beautiful allusion to the river which watered the garden of Paradise (Gen. ii. 10). The reference is not to the rich sacrifices of the sanctuary, but to the temple as the place of Jehovah's earthly residence. Believers may have hard lines in all temporal respects, yet if they enjoy God's presence and favor a crust of bread and a glass of water are incomparably better than a royal banquet without such enjoyment. For with Him is the fountain of all life,

animal and spiritual. Life underived exists in Him (John v. 26), and is the inexhaustible source of whatever blessings come to His creatures. What matters it that all the streams are cut off when one stands near the fountain-head, and has direct access to it? But just as God is the fountain of life, so is He also the fountain of light. "The light dwelleth with Him" (Dan. ii. 22), and apart from Him all is darkness. The true light can be discerned only by those who live in it. Our light must be kindled from God's light. "God alone is the living source of the knowledge of God, and no one has ever found God save through God."\* The believing soul lives in an element of light which at once quickens and satisfies the spiritual faculty, by which heaven and heavenly things are apprehended.

It is quite certain, as an English divine reminds us, that we see nothing by that which is in the object itself. We see it by that which falls upon it from above. This process of seeing everything by a communicated light must go on and on till we arrive at a primary light which shows itself alone. It cannot be known by anything external to itself; it is its own expositor. Such is God. We know Him only by Himself; but knowing Him, we know all things else that are needful for our peace and happiness. Problems are solved, mysteries explained, sorrows relieved when we are in communion with Him who is the light as well as the life of men. In His light we see light. A flood of illuminating radiance falls athwart the darkness of nature, and we know even as we are known.

### III. *The Concluding Prayer* (vv. 10-12).

Continue Thy loving-kindness to them that know Thee,

And thy righteousness to the upright in heart. Let not the foot of pride come upon me,

Nor the hand of the wicked drive me away. Behold where they that work evil are fallen; They are struck down and cannot arise.

To his glowing description of the

blessedness resident in God and flowing forth to the objects of His favor, the psalmist appends a prayer, that it may be extended or prolonged to the class to which he claims to belong. This class is described, first, as those who *know God*, "and, as a necessary consequence, love Him, since genuine knowledge of the true God is inseparable from right affections toward Him;" and, secondly, as the *upright*, not merely in appearance or outward demeanor, but *in heart*. Great as God's loving-kindness is, it is not indiscriminate, nor lavished upon those who neither appreciate nor desire it. What David had asked for others he now asks for himself, plainly implying that the view of human depravity with which the psalm opens had been suggested by his own suffering, or fear of suffering, at the hand of wicked enemies. The language is strong. He asks that he may not be spurned or trampled upon by the foot of the haughty, nor the violence of wicked men send him forth as an unwilling wanderer, shutting him out from home and temple.

The last verse is a mighty triumph of faith. It is as if David said, "There! they have fallen already." The wicked may be swollen with insolence, and the world applaud them, but he despises their destruction from afar as if from a watch-tower, and pronounces it as confidently as if it were an accomplished fact. The defeat is final and irretrievable. The workers of evil fall never to rise. We may not fix times and seasons for God's judgments, but assuredly we may imitate the faith of the Lord's servant, and anticipate with absolute confidence the overthrow of evil-doers and the rescue of the upright in heart. "What is the carpenter's son doing now?" was the scoffing question of a heathen in the days of Julian, when the apostate emperor was off upon an expedition which seemed likely to end in triumph. "He is making a coffin for the emperor," was the calm reply. Faith that is anchored upon the perfections of the Most High cannot waver, cannot be disappointed. The result is

\* Tholuck, *in loco*.

what has been well set forth by another psalm (xcii. 7).

When the wicked spring as the grass,  
And when all the workers of iniquity do flourish ;

It is that they shall be destroyed forever.

#### Who Were the Seers (Chozim)?

THIS term, in its singular and plural forms, is found thirteen times in the historical and three times in the prophetic books of the Old Testament. In eleven instances it is applied to individuals by name: once to Samuel (1 Chron. xxix. 29); thrice to Gad (2 Sam. xxiv. 2; 1 Chron. xxi. 9, and 2 Chron. xxix. 25); once to Heman (1 Chron. xxv. 5); once to Jehu, the son of Hanani the *roeh* (2 Chron. xix. 2); once to Asaph (2 Chron. xxix. 30); once to Jeduthun (2 Chron. xxxv. 15); twice to Iddo (2 Chron. ix. 29, and xii. 15); and once by the false priest Amaziah to Amos (Amos vii. 12).

Of the individuals named, Samuel alone receives also the titles of *roeh* (seer) and *nabi* (prophet). The latter is also conferred upon Gad, Iddo, and Jehu. That the three titles, though all of them borne by Samuel, were not regarded as synonymous seems plainly intimated in 1 Chron. xxix. 29, where we read that "the acts of David, first and last, behold they are written among the words of Samuel the *roeh*, and among the words of Nathan the *nabi*, and among the words of Gad the *chozeh*." And yet that the two former terms were at least measurably interchangeable in the days of Samuel is probable from the assertion of 1 Sam. ix. 9 that the title *roeh* was then applied to one who later came to be known as *nabi*. Not that the former was earlier than the latter, for we find *nabi* in use as early as the time of Abraham (Gen. xx. 7); but, probably by reason of the character of the revelations then given, it became the popular designation during the days of the great founder of the schools of the prophets. Its existence seems to have

been very brief. The title *chozeh* came into use the latest of the three. From the fact that we do not find it before the establishment of the monarchy, and not once after the monarchy ceased to exist, we conclude that it had special reference to the condition of things characterizing that period in Jewish history.

After the disruption under Jeroboam the office of the *chozeh* seems to have been confined exclusively to the Southern Kingdom. It is true, we are told, that Iddo the *chozeh* had visions touching Jeroboam, the son of Nebat; but it is very evident, both from the context and from the ordinary use of the word "visions," that these were declared while Solomon was still upon the throne. In all probability it was due to their proclamation that this great king made his notorious attempts upon the life of Jeroboam. There is no evidence whatever that the *chozeh* was in any wise associated with the latter after the revolt of the ten tribes. That his relations were, on the contrary, exclusively with the Southern Kingdom is made clear by the statements of 2 Chron. xii. 15 and xiii. 22; that the acts of Rehoboam and his son Abijah were recorded among "the words of Iddo concerning genealogies," and in the "*midrash*," commentary or history, of which he was the author. His ability to chronicle these with accuracy demanded a more or less intimate association with the agents themselves.

So in the passage from Amos (vii. 12) where the priest of Bethel (Amaziah) is said to apply the term to that prophet, there is every indication that it was applied as a term of reproach. Because Amos had predicted the overthrow of the Northern king and the captivity of Israel, Amaziah charged him to Jeroboam II. with conspiracy, and coming to him, said, "Thou *chozeh*, go, hide thee to the land of Judah, and there eat bread and prophesy; but do not continue to prophesy longer at Bethel, for it is the sanctuary of the king and the house of the kingdom." By applying to him this title, the priest virtually de-



clared that his affiliations were with the kingdom in the South, where the *chozeh* belonged.

It is of interest to note further, as having a direct bearing on the matter now under consideration, that Jehu, when spoken of in his relation to Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xix. 2) is called *chozeh*, but when addressing himself to Baasha, King of Israel, is called *nabi* (1 Kings xvi. 7, 12) as though it were a well-recognized fact that the official provinces were regarded as distinct when the mission of the messenger was changed from the one kingdom to the other.

Of the *chozim* whose names are given us by the sacred writers, it is of great interest to note that so far as we can trace their genealogy, they are all of Levitical descent. Asaph was a direct descendant of Gershon, the son of Levi (1 Chron. vi. 39-43). Jehu was the son of Hanani (1 Kings xvi. 1), who was the son of Heman (1 Chron. xxv. 4), who was the grandson of Samuel (vi. 33), who was a descendant of Kohath, the son of Levi (vi. 34-38). Jeduthun, also called Ethan (1 Chron. vi. 44), was a descendant of Merari, the son of Levi. The genealogies of Iddo and Gad are not given. The former, however, was an ancestor of the Exilic prophet Zechariah, whose prophecy contains many allusions to the temple service of such character as to hint at his Levitical origin; while the fact that Gad (2 Chron. xxix. 25) is said to have given certain commandments with reference to the song-service of the sanctuary seems to indicate that such was also the case with himself. We, therefore, believe we are justified in the inference that while the *nabi* and the *roch* might be selected from any of the tribes, the *chozeh* was selected only from that of Levi.

We are not able to determine whether or no the office was hereditary. There are some slight indications that such was the case, though the fact that it was not confined to any single genealogical line is evident from the selection of Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun, who

represented three distinct branches of the same original Levitical stock. The frequent use of the phrase "sons of the prophets" certainly suggests that the *nabim* constituted an hereditary order. And, as we have already stated, the prophetic spirit seems to have been transmitted from Samuel to Heman, from Heman to Hanani, and from Hanani to Jehu. So in the time of Jehoshaphat we find it recorded that the spirit of Jehovah came upon Jahaziel, "a Levite of the sons of Asaph." Zechariah describes himself (i. 1) as the grandson of Iddo, who was both *chozeh* and *nabi*, though the former office had passed out of existence in his time. We are also told (1 Chron. xxv. 1) that David appointed the sons of his three *chozim*, Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun, to prophesy with harps, with psalteries, and with cymbals; but it is, of course, impossible for us to say positively that this involved a setting them apart to a distinctively prophetic office, whether as *nabim* or as *chozim*. The data are too meagre for authoritative statement on this point. Amos, concerning whose title to the official name we have already spoken, says of himself that at the time he received his commission he could lay no claim to it, since he was neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet. Yet it is well to keep in mind that while a *chozeh* was necessarily a *nabi*, the *nabi* was not necessarily a *chozeh*, and therefore the same law with reference to the transmission of the office may not have applied in the two cases.

The Divine communications seem to have been made to the *chozim*, as to the *nabim*, now through the medium of the sight, and again through that of the hearing. The name itself does not suggest that these were for the most part of the nature of visions, for the title of seers was given them with special reference to their power of insight into the will and purposes of God, and not with reference to the objective character of the communications which they received. These seem to have been less comprehensive in their sweep than those

which came to the *nabim*, as the office itself was more restricted than that of the *nabim*. The relation of the latter seems to have been to the nation at large; that of the former to the individual at the head of the nation, the reigning monarch. The messages of the latter were national in their bearing; those of the former directly personal. The *chozim*, in other words, seem to have been attached to the royal establishment and to have stood in some particular official relation to the person of the king. In 2 Sam. xxiv. 11 Gad is called "David's *chozeh*," and in 1 Chron. xxi. 9 and 2 Chron. xxix. 25 "the king's *chozeh*." In 1 Chron. xxv. 5 Heman is called "the king's *chozeh*." The same title is applied to Jeduthun in 2 Chron. xxxv. 15.

Just what is involved in the term it would be difficult to say. From the messages of God to David, and of Jehu to Jehoshaphat, and the implications of 2 Chron. xxxiii. 18, we conclude that the *chozim* of the kings of Judah were their spiritual advisers or overseers, who encouraged them in the doing of that which was right in the eyes of Jehovah, and warned them in the event of their defection. But that this did not constitute the entire province of their office seems apparent from other statements concerning them. The acts of David are said to have been recorded in the book of Samuel, the *chozeh*; those of Solomon among the visions of Iddo, the *chozeh*; those of Rehoboam and his son Abijah among the writings of the same individual; those of Jehoshaphat in the book of Jehu; and those of Manasseh among the words of the *chozim* who spoke to him in the name of Jehovah. We judge, therefore, that in addition to the duty of advising sovereigns as to courses of action, that of chronicling the acts themselves belonged to them. They were royal biographers.

But their literary activity was not confined within these limits. Iddo is declared (2 Chron. xiii. 22) to have been the author of a *midrash* (commentary or history), as well as of a work on

genealogies (2 Chron. xii. 15). Asaph was a composer of sacred songs (2 Chron. xxix. 30). He, with Heman and Jeduthun, seems to have formulated a liturgy that was still extant in the days of Josiah (2 Chron. xxxv. 15). Gad also left directions as to the musical service of the sanctuary (2 Chron. xxix. 25), the authoritative character of which was recognized by Hezekiah. The natural inference is that the *chozim* were not simply the spiritual advisers of the sovereigns under whom they served, but that they were also their directors with respect to the management of the temple services—a position which they were the better qualified to fill by reason of their Levitical descent. Some of them were famous as musicians, vocal or instrumental. Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun were appointed by David "over the service of song in the house of Jehovah after the ark had rest" (1 Chron. vi. 31), and the descendants of the first-named, even in post-exilic times, continued in this employment (Neh. vii. 44). Hanani, the son of Heman and father of Jehu, was a performer upon the horn (1 Chron. xxv. 4).

The question cannot fail to arise, Have the writings of these men, whose authority and whose literary activity were so great, been irretrievably lost, or are we to look for them among the sacred Scriptures that have come down to us? To our own mind it seems absolutely certain that very many of them have entered into the composite historical books of the Old Testament, and that others are to be sought in the sacred song books which enter into the composition or compilation known by us as the Psalter. While attaching little importance to the titles of individual psalms, it is well to remember that twelve are ascribed to Asaph (l, lxxiii.-lxxxiii.); one to Heman (lxxxviii.); and one to Ethan (lxxxix.); while twelve are ascribed to "the sons of Korah," probably descendants of Heman, who was in that line of succession, a fact that goes to show the existence of a very ancient tradition that the writings of the seers

were not altogether lost. We believe that careful study will reveal the fact that still more of the psalms are to be traced to their authorship. Psalms l., li., and liii. disclose to our mind many evidences that they are among the words of the *chozim* that were addressed to Manasseh, as some that follow bear many evidences that they were the outcries of his victims during the great persecution instituted by him against the worshippers of Jehovah. No internal consideration favors a Davidic

authorship. The relation of the *chozim* to the song service of the sanctuary, the express statement that certain of them were composers of psalms sung at a late day in the history of that sanctuary, and the character of certain of the psalms, all lead us to the inference that we are to look for many of "the words of the seers" in our Psalter, and that, as the development of many centuries, it has an historical importance fully as great as it has proved its spiritual value to be.

---

## EUROPEAN DEPARTMENT.

CONDUCTED BY J. H. W. STUCKENBERG, D.D., BERLIN, GERMANY.

### The Old and the New.

CRITICISM and condemnation of the Church and the established order in religion have become a kind of mania on the Continent. It has been discovered that the Church is responsible for many existing evils; that she has failed to meet the moral and religious demands made upon her; and therefore some insist on a reformation, while others want a religious revolution. A German pamphlet by a "Modern Theologian" discusses the "Religion of the Future," and severely characterizes the shortcomings of the Church. The views expressed on the present religious status are shared by many. It is affirmed that ministers, by obligating themselves to teach according to the standards of faith, are false to their convictions; the hierarchical spirit is declared too prominent in Protestantism; and that freedom and individuality are suppressed. The continuance of the present condition is pronounced impossible. His views of the religion of the future are, however, too negative to commend themselves to the Christian, being a union of positivism and agnosticism, social and ethical rather than religious. The author wants to destroy rather than to reform the Church. Man is to

be substituted for God, and naturalism is to take the place of divinity.

Novelty is the unconditional demand; and this has been pronounced a disease of the age. Not truth, right, or beauty is made the decisive test of values, but whether a thing is old or new. Men want excitement, and for this they require novelty. They care nothing about conserving and developing well-established truth, and making it the germ of new processes; they care nothing for the long-tried historic forces or the severe demands of reason; if only they can invent something new and startling, they will gladly let the old go. Hence some are intent on rooting out a most valuable tree, when what it needs is simply pruning. This is seen in radical revolutionary tendencies in religion, in anarchical socialism, and in various forms of intellectual scepticism.

The religious radicalism of the day is largely due to the fact that men have lost hope in the Church. Perhaps her enemies are not fair judges. But the most earnest Christians are outspoken in their conviction that the present state of the Church is untenable. They, however, demand no revolution, but a reformation. If heretofore the German Evangelical Church has been obliged to

contend against outward foes, the time is now at hand when she must also contend against the pessimistic spirit within her borders. She is supported by the State, and is dependent. She needs freedom, ought to be thrown on her own resources, and to develop unhindered her own spiritual powers. But to break from her present entanglements means also to break with her entire past, and the difficulties involved seem all but insurmountable.

That within the Church the present condition is regarded untenable is evident from the following quotation from the *Kirchliche Monatschrift*, one of the most orthodox of German journals. German religious literature teems with similar utterances. The writer says :

"The Church is not dead, as was some time since scornfully declared. Inexhaustible vital energies exist in her. The Lord's promises prevent a pessimism which ventures neither to hope nor to undertake anything. But these promises do not apply to the dress and form, which pertain only to the external appearance of the Church. If these prove themselves antiquated, they must be changed. It would be a mistake if, in view of our confidence that the Lord will undoubtedly finally accomplish His purposes, we were idle spectators of the progressive development of affairs. The Lord calls weak men to be His servants, but He wants no idlers. He arouses us through the signs of the times ; He shows us the way, and we must walk therein with decision and with hearts that love His work."

While the Church has correct principles and vital truth which must be cherished, it is admitted that she lacks adaptation. This is felt by believers, and strenuous efforts for this adaptation have become common in Germany. Our author continues :

"A new era has begun ; new aims and new duties are presented to us. The Church has not kept pace with the progress of the age. Help is expected from her, but she is bound hand and foot. In her present garb she is prevented from moving forward. All the world knows that she is urgently in need of reformation, but nothing is done to bring it about. Let us cease to base our hope on the State. The State will not and cannot help our Church. And according to her present organization, the ecclesiastical authorities are nothing but organs of the State. They can do little for the revival of the Church. . . . Is there under these circumstances any hope for the

Church ? She must help herself ; no one else will help her."

These statements are made the basis of an appeal to pastors to organize for the purpose of devising means for the improvement of the Church. Nothing is said about the laity as a co-operative factor ; and this itself reveals how much the Church is regarded as a clerical institution and how greatly lay activity needs development. It is said that by means of the unity of pastors and through pastoral associations "the Church must conquer for herself what she needs." Among preachers the motto is to be adopted "One for all, all for one." Among the prominent subjects for discussion in the pastoral unions are : the demand for timely sermons ; the homiletic treatment of questions of the day ; pastoral visiting ; regaining the alienated masses ; Christian associations ; social problems.

Other efforts at reform abound. They occupy much time and attention at pastoral conventions and church conferences. As is usual in times of great and even wild fermentations, there is much diversity of opinion as to what shall be retained and what new means shall be inaugurated. This much is certain : nothing can take the place of the old and gain the confidence of men, unless it is better than that which it proposes to supplant. The new must be deeper and broader, and more energetic and more effective than the old. Numerous substitutes for religion are now proposed : but they will inevitably fail. They cannot meet human needs, they do not satisfy ; and this lack of adaptation is their condemnation. Not less religion is now the demand, but more. Morality cannot supplant spirituality ; but neither can religionism take the place of morality. The incoming new must evidently be a union of the spiritual and the ethical. The demand for a more inclusive religion is justified. In our day all thought and life form but one organism ; and religion must be organically connected with all that is true and human if it is to meet present de-

mands. But depth is demanded still more than breadth.

Whoever presents a deeper, broader, purer, and more salutary Christianity than is now embodied in the Church will be the true reformer. The Church must have the old, otherwise she ceases to be the Church; but she must also have the new, otherwise she will fall in rear of the age, and will cease to be the light, the salt, and the leaven of the world.

#### Bancroft in Germany.

MR. GEORGE VON BUNSEN has written an appreciative account of his friend Bancroft, which is published in one of the German reviews. The beginning of the article has an especial interest for Americans, and is here translated.

"Bancroft was esteemed as historian much earlier in Europe, and was all along regarded there as worthy of higher honors than in America. The same difference in appreciation was again seen recently, when the news of his death came from Washington, and deeply affected all minds. The English nation, whose dearest prejudices he often ridiculed mercilessly with stinging sarcasm, and to whose institutions he was not always just, uttered nothing but enthusiastic praise in memory of the nobleman. In Germany, where he was regarded something like a native, and to which, next to his own country, he was probably most indebted, all parties vied with each other to do him honor. On the other hand, this scholar, whom the world is inclined to put in the list of greatest Americans, received obituary notices at home which were reserved, cool, and free from all evidences of hero-worship. Perhaps this difference in judging of him is due to the feverish haste in America to rush forward—a haste which has scarcely time to look back on the colonial period and to read thirteen volumes on the origin of the Government. This fact would explain much. Nevertheless, it is strange that one hears nothing of a monument in honor of Bancroft, nothing about a desire for the publication of letters and literary remains, among which there must be some accounts of episodes since the Government was founded."

Of the interesting reminiscences given by Bunsen, the following shows that even as a diplomat Bancroft remained a literary man. He came to Berlin in 1867 as Minister of the United States. Bismarck informed him that King William would receive him on August

28th. The same evening he gave an account of the reception to George von Bunsen. It was customary for the diplomat to deliver an address on presenting his credentials. At his side stood Bismarck, in front of him the king. He began his address by saying that he deemed it an especial honor to begin his diplomatic career on Goethe's birthday. The effect was marked, but not such as Bancroft expected. In his account of the scene he said: "You should have seen how the two gentlemen, the one before me and the other at my left, looked at each other in surprise! I well perceived that they found it difficult not to break out in a hearty laugh. I nevertheless succeeded in finishing my brief address." Both the king and Bismarck treated him very kindly. But he appealed to his friend. "Tell me frankly; did I do an awkward thing?" He thought the reference to Goethe peculiarly appropriate. "I had to address the two most eminent men of modern Germany on August 28th; could I then avoid a reference to the greatest of all Germans?" His friend informed Bancroft that so soon after the war of 1866, when the king and Bismarck were weighed down with cares of State, and were eager to make the best of the new order of things, it was likely that the intellectual labors of Goethe were somewhat foreign to their thoughts. But Bancroft's relations became more and more cordial, and his diplomatic career was eminently successful.

#### Professor Harnack: What can we Learn from the Roman Catholic Church?

IN an address, which has been published, the learned professor discusses this subject. He says that much in the Roman Catholic Church can be understood only when, in judging of it historically, we start not with Jesus and His apostles, but with Cæsar; not with Galilee, but with Rome; and not with the Bible, but with Roman law. That church is the ancient Rome, the Pope is Cæsar, and the Germans are still the

barbarians who are to be subjected. The Roman Catholic Church is likewise a school and an insurance association—a school for those eternally immature, and an insurance association for such as desire the blessings of the Gospel without being seized by the inner power of that Gospel. Still that church retains in its midst the Gospel; it has always had good Christians, and no doubt has some now. What, now, can we as Protestants learn from this church?

First, we can learn patience. If in the fifteenth century a church historian had inquired into the nature of Roman Catholicism, he would have found the answer difficult, on account of the various tendencies, doctrines, and aims then prevalent. Turning to Gerson, to Hus, to Thomas à Kempis, to Pope Pius II., to Savonarola, or to Picus of Mirandola, he would in each case have received a different answer. "The Protestant Church is as manifold to-day as the Catholic Church was at that time; yet Protestantism is only three and a half centuries old. From this we can learn that confessions develop very slowly, and only gradually give a clear revelation of their essence. Roman Catholicism has required for its development over 1500 years. Measured by this standard, we can, perhaps, say that Protestantism is still in the period when children's diseases prevail, and we ought to be patient and courageous."

Secondly, we learn from the history of this church, which depends so essentially on organization, that its progress and revival were never promoted by its organization, but always by the efforts of living, devout members. The great monks, not the great politicians have promoted progress; or, rather, it was through the politicians only because they stood on the shoulders of the monks. Not in constitutions, but in persons who have freed themselves from the world and have found their strength in God is there hope. A Francis was greater than many an ecclesiastical prince. More freedom is of itself not enough; if there is no real life, free-

dom is useless; and if there is life, the barriers are no hindrance.

Thirdly, we can learn from the Roman Church the idea of catholicity, the tendency toward a general and effective brotherhood of man through the Gospel, the striving to realize Christ's thought of one shepherd and one flock. "I believe I am entitled to say that an earnest Catholic feels more keenly than we the blessing of a great Christian communion, more painfully the divisions of Christendom, and more conscientiously the duties imposed on all believers." There are many Protestants who not only think the separation of Catholics and Evangelical Christians natural, but think it not strange that the latter are divided into countless State and free churches, so that the members of the various communions actually refuse each other the fraternal greetings. "With all possible energy we ought to strive to bring about the Christian unity of mankind; we ought to be generous and large-hearted in our little communions in order to be capable of believing that the fraternal unity of humanity is no dream, but an aim essentially connected with the Gospel."

Professor Harnack thinks that all will admit the possibility of learning from Roman Catholicism in these respects. On the following points he thinks, however, there may be difference of opinion. He is careful to guard the Protestant standpoint, yet believes that in our opposition to Rome we have in some respects gone to the extreme. Thus he thinks that we have lost too much the idea of worship. Our religion and worship have become too dogmatic. "Religion is a life—a life in God; and it should always manifest itself as life whenever it attempts to express itself. Life in God is worship." Mere forms of worship, without the life and spirit, are to be deprecated. How to make worship more prominent and make it supplant some of the excessive dogmatic elements, the professor does not suggest. But he thinks that the prominence given to worship in Catholicism teaches us an

important lesson. It is important to go back to the method of the primitive Church. "Her assemblies served the purpose both of worship and of brotherly love. We do not want to lose what we have; but we must change the life of our divine services in order not to lose what we have."

He also thinks that the opposition of Protestantism to the service of the mass and the abuses of sacrifice has resulted in the loss of all emphasis on the duty of sacrifice. Yet there never was a religion whose life did not consist in the idea of sacrifice. Protestants indeed demand that the whole personality be offered as a sacrifice; but this is too often an ineffective theory. Real sacrifice is necessary. "One must make sacrifices if he has ideals, and wants to gain or hold spiritual treasures. A man's ideals are in proportion to his sacrifices. Too little self-denial is required of us, and too seldom do we hear the earnest admonition to our generation that it is afraid of sacrifice, and therefore lacks zeal, courage, and character."

Protestantism has put in the place of penance the penitential spirit which proceeds from faith. A great forward step was taken by making forgiveness depend on repentance; but we have sustained a loss by wholly giving up confession, except a general kind of confession in worship, and on the part of children, who are taught to confess their sins, and on the part of criminals. Yet there are many Christians who feel the need of having someone to whom they can speak freely and heartily about their shortcomings. There is to be no obligatory auricular confession; but our Evangelical Church ought to make provision for Christians to bear one another's burdens in this respect.

The destruction of the monkish system was an emancipatory act on the part of the Reformation. "Yet was there not an element of truth in that system? No one will deny this who appreciates the deaconess's institutes." An organization requires rules, and

those who want to serve their neighbor in an unusual degree must freely abandon the entanglements of this world's goods and must practise obedience to salutary laws. Just now, in the midst of our social and churchly needs, there is an especial demand for associations which are animated by the spirit of the pure and righteous monks. We require men in the service of the Gospel who forsake all to help those whom no one helps. Evangelical monks will be different from the Catholic; they will know nothing of self-earned merit, and will be able at any moment to retire without shame and disgrace from their position. "The Evangelical Churches will either become still weaker than they are at present, or love will make them inventive, and they will develop what has no form as yet, but what is evidently needed and is beginning to germinate. As we have missionaries for the heathen, who freely sacrifice much, so surely can we also have associations of brothers, who for the sake of serving such as are in the highways and hedges readily make sacrifices."

More briefly Professor Harnack discusses what we are not to adopt from Catholicism. We ought not to make her dogmatics, her organization, and her cultus our own. Our Church must be intellectually progressive, while the Catholic remains essentially where she stood in the thirteenth century. "All that she adds besides is nothing but decoration or political means to an end. The ecclesiastical constitution she declares divine is that which Innocent III. and Innocent IV. completed; her dogmatics is that of Thomas Aquinas and of his more lax followers; the only science which she can use is that of the Middle Ages. She loves, indeed, to adorn herself with the Egyptian and Assyrian discoveries of several half-learned persons, and to let the stones speak to her in the manner of modern archaeology, and even, so far as possible, to appropriate the latest results of scientific research. But all this is for the sake of throwing sand in the eyes of men. She must pass

by all the actual problems, and what is now called history, criticism, and philosophical knowledge cannot exist for her. That church is still in the Middle Ages, is behindhand six hundred years, and lives yet because modern men make mistakes, and do not understand how to meet the needs of the human heart." What the last two hundred years have discovered respecting the history of the Bible and of primitive Christianity does not exist for this church, or else is only toyed with or used merely as an intellectual exercise, and is made the most of for her own advantage, so far as this is possible.

It is to be lamented that in many cases these sad mistakes of Rome are imitated by Protestants. "Is Protestantism in league with all the real knowledge attained in our age, as was the case with the apologists of the second century; or does it sneak suspiciously and with a cavilling spirit behind the times? Do not many of its most esteemed representatives despise science?" The churches are in many respects behind the intellectual attainments of the age. Religion is often taught in a way that savors of superstition, and repels the intellectual conscience. "Shall the Evangelical churches also become petrifications?" There is a lack of earnest seeking of the truth and of a readiness to sacrifice for its sake. Some do not want to agitate others, so they are slow in the promotion of the truth. But for fear that ten might be disturbed, one hundred are repelled; and while the weak are spared, the strong are offended. The Catholic Church can force submission to its decrees, but the Protestant Church must respect the truth, individuality, and conscience. Protestants depend on the Gospel, and that is the only law to be followed in making reforms.

Neither are we to subject ourselves to ecclesiasticism, as is done in Catholicism. There was a time in Protestantism when it was not necessary to raise a warning voice against this subjection; but that time is long past. "Where

absolute obedience reigns in the realm of religion, there conscience ceases to act. That is evident from all those bishops who accepted the dogma of infallibility after its proclamation, though before that time they had violently opposed it. According to the view of the Catholic religion, they made the greatest sacrifice, and I should not be surprised if they were all canonized. According to the view of the religion which stands and falls with conscience, they have committed a grievous sin." This kind of submission is a churchliness which we ought to leave to Roman Catholicism, without imitation on our part.

Another evil in Catholicism to be avoided is the fanaticism which characterizes that church. She professes to be a state, and uses for her purposes the egotism and fanaticism of a state. We must be tolerant; and, more than that, we are to learn to appreciate what is opposed to us. This rule should be adopted respecting the Catholic Church. We must remember that we ourselves are not perfect. "For that the Church of the Reformation can be improved, and has actually learned very much since the days of Luther, must be evident to the weakest; and it is our pride and our joy that we are capable of learning."

Much more might be said respecting what we are not to adopt from Roman Catholicism. "As a summary, I might say that our Church is not to be a state, is not to be a school for such as are forever to be kept in a condition of immaturity, and is not to be a sacramental insurance association. I could lay my finger on the difference between the clergy and laity, and ask whether we are altogether free from the danger of demanding from pastors and theologians a Christianity different from that of the laity."

The address closes as follows: "In the midst of the fermentations of the day, may our Evangelical Church be organized with a firm but broad confession; may she learn how better to



preach the Gospel to our generation, and how to form an alliance with every truth; and may she then so develop as to become a brotherhood amid our divided humanity, a brotherhood as comprehensive as human life and as deep as human needs."

#### Opposition to Biblical Criticism.

PROFESSOR HEINRICH, in his last edition of Meyer's "Commentary on 2 Corinthians," protests against the wild efforts of critics to put the origin of the leading epistles in the second century, and thus deny their Pauline authorship. These critics, in order to carry their point, ignore the testimony of early Christian writers, and invent theories which have no foundation except in their fancy. Thus books which have a thoroughly Pauline character, and imply the authorship of some great and original mind like that of Paul, are supposed to be mere patchwork, or to be the product of some unknown author, and to have been imposed on early Christian writers and on the Church itself as the work of the apostle of faith. It is these men, each with his peculiar subjective theory, with his peculiar inventions and methods of construction, who are the worst enemies of Biblical criticism. They throw discredit on the whole process by their baseless assumptions, their extravagant claims, and their contradictory results.

There is no question among Continental scholars that this false criticism can be met only by the true criticism. All admit that the investigation both of the Old and the New Testament must be perfectly free, untrammelled by dogmatic prepossessions, thorough, using all the results of philosophical, scientific, linguistic, and historic research. Great efforts are made to perfect the methods and means of Biblical criticism. What can be finally settled is to be determined only after the most searching inquiry. If criticism is perverted, it can be corrected only by deeper, broader, and more perfect criti-

cism, just as science can be met only by science, just as history can be formed only by historic methods. We are in the critical era, and nothing can check the course or prevent the prevalence of calm, relentless Biblical and historical criticism.

Some German scholars are hasty in their critical conclusions. They proclaim as absolutely established what the next investigator pronounces unfounded and worthless. But other results are accepted by the most conservative scholars. Men like the deceased Delitzsch, and like Professor Grau, although conservative and orthodox, admit that our views of the Bible need revision. But they differ from the negative critics in that they are slower in adopting new theories, and also in that they emphasize the positive elements which remain firm in spite of all the results of negative criticism.

The opposition to biblical criticism comes largely from preachers. A significant statement on this subject was made by Dr. R. Loeber, court preacher in Dresden, in an address on the *Certain Results of Biblical Criticism*, which has passed through three editions. He defines his aim as follows: "To show that by means of the certain results of biblical criticism the foundations of the Word of God were not shaken, but that only new sources of the sacred Scriptures had been opened to us, sources which we cannot ignore without reaching a state of stagnation." Himself a pastor in a most prominent position, he declares that the opposition to biblical criticism is due largely to the indolence, the self-satisfaction, and the conceit of pastors. They do not want to be disturbed in their idle security; they are unwilling to enter upon a candid investigation of the problems involved; and they make their indolence and ignorance the grounds of their opposition.

It is interesting to notice the attitude of Luthardt's orthodox journal to this severe charge. Instead of rising to the defence of the pastors, it says: "It is certain that in many ministerial circles

the idleness and self-satisfaction are so great that they must be shaken if the preachers are to be aroused." This, of course, does not imply that there are not other grounds of opposition; but it reveals the most unreasonable and most worthless, not to say disgraceful sources.

Among the most earnest investigators of biblical criticism in Germany are students, preachers, and professors from America. They usually enter on their work with a reverent regard for Scripture, but with the utmost freedom, and with the determination to do the most thorough work and to make the truth triumphant. If they come with any prejudices against biblical criticism, these soon vanish; and they welcome the best critical methods as conditions of mental peace and firmness, and for doing the most solid work in their native land. Their past training and their intellectual maturity are a guarantee that they will not be easily swayed by the opinions of the professors, but will investigate for themselves. One of these students said recently: "I am now investigating the post-exilic period in order to find out what conditions for the production of biblical books existed at that time." The work done by these American students convinces me that the methods and results of biblical criticism will more and more permeate theological learning in the United States. No opposition can possibly prevent this. Our only hope is in making that criticism pure, true, reverential, and thorough. Instead of being the means of destruction, as is so often the case on the Continent, it should be made the means of mercilessly removing all error for the sake of the perfect construction of a true biblical theology.

---

**Three Months in a Factory. Experience of a Theological Student as an Ordinary Laborer.**

AFTER completing his theological studies in the University of Berlin, and passing his examination, Paul Goehre resolved to study the labor problems

among laborers themselves. He donned old garments, went to Chemnitz, a manufacturing centre of Saxony, and applied for work. In order to secure employment he had to reveal himself to the managers of one of the machine works; but none of his fellow-laborers discovered his station and his purpose. Of the five hundred men employed, he came into intimate contact with about one fourth, namely, those working in the same department with himself. He was a common hand-laborer, was treated exactly like the other workmen, dressed and lived as they did, and associated with them as their equal. He earned five cents an hour, or nearly three dollars a week. At the end of three months he was obliged to withdraw on account of his health. In a book entitled "Three Months in a Factory," he gives the interesting and valuable results of his experiences and studies. He shows how he pursued his inquiries; describes the material condition of his fellow-laborers, and the nature and influence of work in the factory; gives accounts of the socialistic agitations among the workmen, and of their socialistic and political views; discusses the culture, religion, and moral character of the men; and in the last chapter gives the results of his study, and what he regards as requirements to meet the needs of laborers.

The volume deserves the great interest it has excited. It gives a fair, intelligent, experimental view of factory life, with accounts of the aspiration and efforts of workmen to rise into better condition. The revelations contain food for serious thought. They show that the factories are schools for the promotion of materialistic and anarchical socialism. Of the one hundred and twenty men with whom his work brought the author in constant contact, he could discover only three who were pronounced opponents of the social democracy. The laboring men breathe an atmosphere saturated with socialistic ideas; socialistic meetings take the place of the church, and socialistic agitations are

preferred to the Christian pulpit. Socialism is their gospel. The author repeatedly heard fellow-laborers declare "that in the future Bebel and Liebknecht will hold the place heretofore held by Jesus Christ."

We cannot dwell on the rich experiences of the author; their results and the inferences he draws from them are of more value to us.

His studies convinced him that the labor problem is deeper and more comprehensive than that of food and wages. The question of wages is usually the beginning of socialistic agitation; but it is not the only problem, perhaps not even the most important. The labor problem involves culture and religion, as well as wages. Laborers long for more recognition and higher appreciation, and for a better social position. Instead of being tools of others, or mere machines, they want to be free persons, working with the head as well as with the hands, and contributing their part to the promotion of the higher interests of humanity. There is a mighty impulse to enjoy the blessings of culture and knowledge, often but a blind impulse, yet real, and to be satisfied only by education. This ideal element is one of the strongest factors in German socialism.

For the realization of their aspirations and ideals the laborers look to the social democracy; therefore, that movement has become the hope of millions. The labor movement and socialism have therefore become synonymous, and are likely to be so in the future. This gives the socialistic tendency such power, and it is futile to suppose that it can be checked. It will undoubtedly grow not only in the cities, but also in the country. Christian institutions and Christian labor associations have grand missions; but they cannot root out socialism. While, however, socialism is destined to continue and grow, it may be trained, ennobled, and consecrated; and the accomplishment of this end should enlist all the Christian energies.

How can this ennobling work be

done? The just demands of the millions of laborers must be honestly and fairly met. Whatever is done for laborers by the State or society must be done with the consent and aid of laborers themselves. The time for subjecting them to patriarchal dominion is at an end. Laborers have become aware of their rights and their power, and demand an active part in the social reformation which concerns their highest interests.

In the training and consecration of the social democracy an important mission is given to the Church. German socialism is not merely a political party, not merely the advocate of a new political economy, but it is also the embodiment of a view of the universe, a view that is materialistic and bitterly hostile to Christianity. The materialism embodied in socialism is professedly based on science. The social, political, intellectual, ethical, and religious views of the laboring classes are largely dominated by materialistic principles. This makes the work of the Church evident; the Christian view must overthrow the materialistic and atheistic. The Church is not called on to solve political and economic problems; her mission is ethical and religious. Were the social state inaugurated, the pastors could labor with others four or six hours a day, and then devote the rest of the time to spiritual duties, just as Paul labored with his hands and also preached the Gospel. The author says: "We must realize the fact that a social democrat can be a Christian, and that a Christian can be a social democrat."

This religious task can be accomplished only by breaking the materialistic backbone of socialism. The falsehood of perverted materialistic science must be exposed, and a true science must be put in its place. Men of culture must go from the university and study to the people, and share with the laborers their intellectual treasures. Let the aspiration from below be met by the possessions of the best culture. The hope in behalf of the masses is in the

communication of healthy knowledge where now poisonous and destructive principles predominate. Protestant ministers must make it their joy to seek out laborers in the workshop, to meet them in their associations and homes, to adapt the pure Gospel to their capacity and needs, and thus lead them to a strong and satisfying faith.

His experience convinced the author that the laborers cannot be won by antiquated views and methods. Labor, as well as culture, rejects an unadapted religion. Eternal truths are often presented in such a way that men cannot find in them the peace and salvation and certainty they seek and need. As a consequence, they reject the substance as well as the form. What of the essence is thus rejected theologians must take up; the old forms must be changed, in order that the full glory and truth of Christian faith may appear, with new points of view and new energies, adapted to present men and actual needs. In this work modern science can be of immense value. "We need not abandon an iota of the power and essence of our Christianity. The contents are eternal, the form is changeable." No individual can do this work; all earnest Christians are required to do their part. Preparatory steps have already been taken. "By mutual efforts, gradually, in harmony, with earnestness and calm consideration, but also with courage and with power, we who are called to be the present and the future ministers must do the work, always basing our efforts on the historic person of Jesus of Nazareth, whose quiet grandeur is the sole object before which the laborer of to-day will bow his head. But this work must be done, otherwise—that is my firm conviction, based on the bitterest experience—there will for a long time be an end of Christianity down at the bottom, and probably elsewhere also." He thinks there is especial need of personalities who are the embodiment of Christianity and are controlled by an invincible faith. The lack of such personalities, and of churches

in which they prevail, leaves on laborers the impression that the Christian religion is mere theory, with no practical value for life, with no real nourishment for empty, hungry souls. Churches organized for work, animated by the spirit of Christian equality in all classes, doing the best works of love and mercy for the poor and needy, such churches, with pious pastors and active laymen, can work wonders. If mockers ask, "Whence the efficiency of these churches?" we shall answer, with the first Christians: "Through the power of Jesus of Nazareth."

---

#### Notes.

THE number of students in German universities during this summer was 28,625. In the summer of 1890 there were 29,317; in the winter of 1890-91, 28,711. Compared with last winter, the following changes have occurred: the medical students have increased from 8776 to 8907; law students, from 7263 to 7381; Catholic students of theology, from 1221 to 1301. The following have decreased: Evangelical students of theology, from 4273 to 4251; students of philosophy, philology, and history, from 3151 to 2968; students of mathematics and natural sciences, from 2286 to 2168.

---

THE efforts to produce a solidarity of laborers in different countries have had but little effect except to call international conventions, to establish more sympathy between the socialists of various lands, and to promote co-operation in some general movements, as in the case of strikes, and in securing legal enactments respecting hours of labor, the work of women and children in factories, and rest on Sunday. There has been much speculation on the attitude of socialists in case of war. Their utterances, both in France and Germany, have led to the suspicion that international socialism might be stronger than national patriotism. Lately, however, Vollmar, a socialistic member of the

German Parliament, addressed a meeting of socialists, and declared that in war the German social democrats would stand by their country. He was especially severe in denouncing the barbarism of Russia, and emphasized the need of opposing the aggressive movements of that country. His utterances excited much attention, and agitated socialist meetings have been held for the discussion of his views. While he is violently opposed by some in his party, his declarations are received with favor by the majority; and were war to break out with Russia or France, the social democrats would no doubt take their place with other German patriots in advocating the cause of their country.

THE intellectual life of the Turkish empire is mainly concentrated in Constantinople. During the year 1890 there were published in that city 940 books and pamphlets. Of these, 497 were in Turkish, 86 in Arabian, 15 in Persian, 156 in Greek, 120 in Armenian, 23 in French, 2 in English, 2 in German, 15 in Italian, 9 in Spanish, and the remainder in other languages. The most numerous literary productions consisted of novels and theatrical plays in Turkish. Most of the Armenian books are of a religious character. The learned works on philology, law, and dogmatics are mostly in Arabian, the scholarly language of the Turks.

THEY are introducing a novel method in Belgium for the purpose of determining whether Sunday shall be a day of rest for mail carriers. Sunday postage-stamps are to be provided. All letters with such stamps mailed on Saturday are to be delivered on Monday. After trying the experiment for awhile, it is to be decided, according to the relative number of letters with these stamps, whether the majority of the letter-writing public want the postmen to rest on Sunday. If they do, then the carriers are to be freed from their Sunday work.

A RECENT work of Professor A. Gretillat on dogmatics (*Exposé de Théologie Systematique*) calls attention to the fact that within the last two hundred years French Protestantism has done very little in this department. Since the appearance of the work of B. Pictet in 1708 (*La Théologie Chrétienne*), only one complete work on dogmatics has appeared—that of Chenevière, in 1840, which was based on rationalistic principles.

A PRUSSIAN official was lately asked, "Why does Prussia give the Catholic Church sixteen million marks as a premium for violating the State laws?" The money had been withheld from that Church because her bishops and priests refused to comply with the laws. The State said, "If you will not obey the laws, we will not pay you out of the funds of the State." But now that enormous sum has been voted to the disobedient and defiant prelates. The Government declares that the Church has no legal claim on the money, but it is voted as a peace measure. The official gave the following reply to the question: "We are obliged to govern with the Catholics." So powerful has that Church become in Protestant Prussia that the Government yields point on point in order to secure the support of the Catholic Centre, now the leading political party in Germany.

Scarcely has the money been voted when the ultramontane press in Rome and Germany insists that this submission of the Prussian Government is only the beginning of peace. Not only is the most liberal support demanded by the Catholic Church from the Government, but she also insists on managing her own affairs; and every one knows that this means opposition to the State whenever ultramontaniam sees fit to oppose. Clamorous demands are made for the return of the Redemptorists, who were banished with the Jesuits because the governments found them closely allied to that body; but now it is claimed that they are entirely different. Equally

urgent is the demand for the return of the Jesuits. This is not all. The ultramontanes declare that peace cannot be thought of until the priests have control of the schools in Catholic regions. And not a few Protestants are fearful that every ultramontane demand will be granted by the Government in order to secure the votes and the favor of the ultramontanes.

EARNEST Protestants keenly feel that their own governments and princes help the cause of Rome and weaken that of Evangelical Christianity. Thus a writer deploras the fact that the Lutheran Crown-Princess of Sweden, when in Rome recently, called on the Pope at the very hour when services were conducted in the German Evangelical Church, where she, being a princess of

Baden, was naturally expected. Protestants also lament the peculiar favor with which Catholic prelates are received by Protestant princes on public and festive occasions, while eminent evangelical preachers and theologians receive no recognition. At his visits to Breslau and Cologne the Emperor showed marked favor to Catholic bishops, but representatives of the Protestant Church were ignored. When bishops are to be consecrated, Protestant State officials are obliged to be present at the service of the mass and at the banquet, where the first toast is always to the Pope, not to their sovereign. Not only do evangelical Christians feel deeply humiliated, but they lose confidence in the Government to do justice to the Protestant State Church, which is controlled so largely by the Government.

## MISCELLANEOUS SECTION.

### Certain Modes of Modern Orthodoxy.

By T. C. MARSHALL, STAFF-CAPTAIN  
OF THE SALVATION ARMY.

It is not any matter of surprise that there should be division of opinion among Christians concerning the Salvation Army, because there is so much to be seen on the outside that is directly contrary to the time-honored conventionalities and traditions of the churches, and so much to be found inside that is opposed to the natural tastes and inclinations of individuals.

It must also be admitted that it takes time and trouble to find out what the Army *is*, although it is not usually difficult to obtain a fairly correct idea as to what it *does*; and, further, that those lovers of God who are themselves the most active workers for Him naturally have little time or inclination to greatly interest themselves in, much less examine, the labors of other evangelists.

Nevertheless, there is not a church in the land that could not with profit take

the trouble, first, to investigate the fundamental principles upon which the Army works and the doctrines it inculcates, and second, to adopt such of its methods as are suited to the field in which that church is situated. I am not claiming that the Army is superior to any church, or all of them, but it is only stating a fact to say that on certain and differing lines all can learn something from it.

Nor are good reasons far to seek. One of these lies in the fact that the Army is a child of the present age, as is no church, and many of those features which are most repugnant to many minds are merely reflections of life and thought in the outer world which are of comparatively recent development; and a large section of the community is indifferent to much church effort because of a feeling that the methods and principles of the workers are out of date.

Another reason, and the only other referred to now, is the utilization by the headquarters and the officers in

every country of personal experience and business method for evangelistic purposes. The modes, as well as the teaching of the denominations, may be said to be, say, at least fifty years old. The feeling and attitude of the public mind on religious subjects have during that period undergone many changes. In those days there was an acceptance of religious truth—outward, at any rate—from preachers and parents rarely found now. Nobody to-day will admit that any one but himself is responsible for his religious belief—or more usually disbelief. To accept any spiritual belief from another would be considered an evidence of a weak mind; and as there are many religions in the world, the ordinary citizen in most cases saves himself the trouble of adopting any by rejecting all.

Again, elderly persons can remember when there was a degree of respect for law and for human authority that is now almost extinct; and even in those countries governed by autocrats "terror" rather than respect characterizes the feelings of the nation. Here, at any rate, every boy ten years old thinks himself as good a man as his father and the President put together, and, what is of more consequence in this connection, than the minister of his church.

Now to these two prominent features of modern life the churches, as a whole, have been almost indifferent, so far as practical work goes. It is true that individual ministers have not been ignorant of these changes, but they have usually made the mistake of altering their *doctrine* to suit their hearers, instead of changing their *mode* of putting the old teaching. But even these gentlemen form no considerable proportion of ministers, and speaking generally, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that the doctrines of fifty years ago are set forth in much the same way as they were half a century since. Never was there a more glaring attempt to put old wine into new bottles; and never has there been such a demonstration on a wholesale scale of the failure of the at-

tempt as is the condition of the world to-day.

Now the Salvation Army is the embodiment of the most ancient and inflexible orthodoxy dealing with the sin and infidelity of the nineteenth-century sinners according to nineteenth-century methods, and using all kinds of nineteenth-century weapons for that end.

It is Sunday morning; time, 10.30 a.m. George Washington Slocum is on the stoop of his house smoking his pipe and reading his Sunday paper. He can hear the bells of half a dozen churches from where he sits, but he is not going to any of them. He is not a particularly wicked man, as men go. Indeed, he is by far the most sober and industrious man who lives in that street.

If he were spoken to about religion, he would say that it was a first rate thing for those who had it, but he did not believe in it himself. He could not see that those who professed it were very different from those who did not; and anyway, there were a good many things in the Bible he did not believe, etc. If he could see somebody raised from the dead, or something of that kind done, he might think there was something in it.

Without asking how nine ministers out of ten would deal with this man, let us ask, How will the Salvation Army handle George?

In the first place, seeing that George will not come to hear it, it goes to his own street and talks and sings to him there.

Just as he has reached the most exciting part in the story of a murder, he hears a bass drum round the corner, and presently half a dozen men in queer uniform and two or three women, distinguished by tamborines and poke bonnets, form a ring just in front of his door.

They are singing as they come up, and they are not singing about "Beautiful Zion" or "The Home Over There," because they know that George and his neighbors are not ready yet for such songs. But they sing something plain,

practical, and suited to their congregation, as

"Oh, the drunkard may come, and the swearer may come,  
Backsliders and sinners are all welcome home."

or,

"Oh, yes, there's salvation for you!  
Oh, yes, there's salvation for you!  
Salvation for all kinds of sinners,—  
Oh, yes, there's salvation for you!"

George listens. He listens not because he likes it or believes it, but because the singing interests him, and he wonders what these cranks are going to do next.

Presently all the men take off their red-banded caps, and one of them prays. George can understand every word and every allusion. There is very little reference to the wonders of creation, though very likely God will be thanked if the weather be fine; quotations will be few, and allusions to the President, the affairs of the nations and the Church universal will be conspicuous by their absence, and no listener will imagine for a moment that the speaker fancies himself surrounded by saints.

The prayer will be short, and something after this fashion:

"O Lord, we thank You for this fine morning, and for another chance to tell these dear people that You can save them from their sins. Thou knowest that they are living in rebellion against You, and that the devil has them fast in his grip. We know that they will surely go to a burning hell if they don't give up their sins and come to You for pardon. O Lord, help them to see You before it is too late! We're glad we know You, and we thank You for the joy and peace we have enjoyed ever since we found salvation at the cross. O Lord, bless these people, and help us to say something that shall make them come to You. Amen."

As this prayer proceeds, George will notice that almost every sentence is punctuated by responses from the other soldiers, and he will feel pretty sure that the religion of these people is genu-

ine to *them*, whatever it may be to others.

There will be some more singing, and then there will be some talking, not preaching. If one of the company were to produce a Bible and begin to explain a passage of Scripture, George would go in the house and shut the door. Nobody knows this better than the drum-beating evangelists; so they keep their Bibles in their pockets and go in for giving George something of which he can test the truth from independent witnesses if he likes.

Therefore, a man who used to be like himself, only perhaps worse, stands out and states those facts from his history that will hit George hardest. He tells how he used to be a slave of drink, or tobacco, or gambling, and how his family used to suffer because of his manner of life. He talks definitely as to the time and place of his conversion, and probably finishes by a comparative statement with regard to the value of his personal property now and what it was six or twelve months ago.

Now George is interested in this, listens to the end, and when the invitation is given to come to the barracks, he makes a mental note that some time or other he will do so.

It is not necessary to pursue the illustration further; but this scene can be witnessed on any Sunday, and frequently on week-days where the Army enjoys open-air privileges.

Now the doctrine taught in that little ring was substantially the same as George might have heard at most of the churches whose bells called him to worship that morning, as for years before. There was nothing new in the theology, while the poke-bonnets, red jerseys, and drum were probably offensive to his taste.

But the real secret of the success of the meeting, so far as he was concerned, was that his 1891 mind was dealt with by 1891 methods, and not those of A.D. 1800.

In his heart and life George had said, "I won't go to church."



The Army replied, "If you won't come to our church, we'll bring our church to you."

George said, "I don't believe in what I don't see."

The Army replied, "Then we'll show you something you can see, and for which you cannot account without admitting the existence of the supernatural."

George said, "I don't believe in the Bible."

The Army replied, "We don't ask you to, but we will show you living people that you can't help believing in, if you take the trouble to examine the facts."

George said, "I don't believe in the authority of anybody to teach me about religion. My head is quite as good as that of any parson. I do all my thinking for myself."

The Army replied, "We don't set ourselves up to teach you about religion. We bear witness of what God can do and has done, and the better thinker you are, the sooner will you be convinced of the truth of what we say, and the more sense you have, the sooner you will turn away from your sins and seek salvation."

The uniform and continued success of the Army's evangelistic efforts in lands as different as Scotland and Ceylon, Newfoundland and Natal, India and Ireland, France and Finland, Germany and Australia, Sweden and Switzerland, the Argentine Republic and the United States, is the best certificate of the value of its principles, and should afford ground for hope to those who fear that the rapidly rising tide of atheism and every other form of devilism will ultimately submerge the entire human race.

#### What Protestant Preachers May Learn from Catholic Priests.

By M. F. CUSACK [THE NUN OF KENMARE].

A GREAT deal has been written and said on the subject of early training,

and yet its importance can scarcely be over-estimated, nor can its advantages be too much insisted upon. I can speak from personal experience on this subject. I doubt if I would ever have been freed from the entanglements of Rome if I had not had the unspeakable advantage of an early and scriptural education. I may say I am often asked why, with such an education, I ever entered the Church of Rome; and here I can only briefly reply, because I was entirely deceived as to the teaching of the Church of Rome. And this statement leads up to the subject of the present article.

Rome not only knows the immense advantages of early education, but she also, with that consummate wisdom which is of this world, takes care to use her knowledge. Rome seizes on the opening intellect, and places the seal of her teaching on the infant mind at the very dawn of its reason. This, I believe, is the secret of the power of Rome. And here is one subject on which the Protestant, or rather, I would say, the Christian minister can learn from the Catholic priest. Surely the world at large does not need to be reminded of the determined attitude of Rome on the question of education. Rome must and will have the education of the young; and Protestants not only allow this, but they will even allow Rome to have the education of their own children. We hear a great deal of the "liberality" of Rome; that she has changed; that she is no longer intolerant. One glance at her authorized catechisms will show that she is, if possible, more intolerant to-day than even in the darkest ages of her history. One moment's reflection on her political attitude in the United States on the question of education should convince the most sceptical. A little knowledge of the inside history of affairs in Ireland would have thrown a new light on the action of the Irish bishops in recent political affairs in Ireland. Rome was looking for an opportunity to crush a man who would not be her humble ser-

vant in the matter of educational arrangements with the English Government. She knew his private history well for many years; but she waited, as Rome alone can wait, for the supreme moment when she could come before the world with a specious reason for crushing one who would not be her tool. Here is another evidence of Rome's determination to make education her first object. I know, of my own personal knowledge, that if Parnell had been obedient to the dictates of ecclesiastical authority on the education question, his private character would have mattered very little. There is evidence enough even here that Rome is not particular as to the character of her political tools.

When do we hear of Protestant ministers who warn their flock openly and constantly of the danger to children from association with Roman Catholics, or who denounce them if they send their children to Roman Catholic schools? It is amazing how much wiser the children of this world are than the children of light.

I have often heard Protestants say, "What is the secret of the power which Rome has over her people?" The answer is not far to seek. She has secured her hold on the mind of the young, and she easily maintains it on the minds of the old. The manner in which the young are instructed in the Church of Rome has not received the attention that it deserves. In fact, the whole question of the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church should be studied far more carefully than it has been. Unfortunately, as I have said elsewhere, Protestants have too often been deceived by adventurers who simply wanted to make a living by sensation, and unfortunately, also, sensation is more interesting than fact. But it is time that facts were known, and that men who do not desire this country to become what France, Italy, and Ireland are to-day should see for themselves what Rome is doing to degrade America to the same moral and intellectual level.

It is never unjust to any church to

judge her teaching from her accepted formularies. Rome has left the world in no doubt about hers. Every catechism which she uses is approved by the Church, and is, therefore, infallible in its teaching. In these catechisms Rome begins with teaching the child the moment it has the use of reason that the "Church" is the one source of authority and the one means of salvation. No words can be plainer than those which are used to this end. Further, Rome teaches the child that every Protestant is eternally damned; and this in the very plainest language. Imagine how Rome would exclaim if there was a Protestant catechism published and taught in schools supported by public money in which these words should be used.

*Q.* Can any one be saved out of the [*mutatis mutandis* Protestant] Roman Catholic Church?

*A.* Out of the [Protestant] Roman Catholic Church no one can be saved, because Jesus Christ never gave, nor will He ever give any other church for the salvation of men.

This question and answer are taken from the catechism published in New York for the use of parochial schools, and authorized by the Pope in definite terms. Suppose that Protestants published a catechism, and insisted in having it taught in all their schools in which the Roman Catholic Church was thus denounced, what an outcry there would be and what denunciation of Protestant "illiberality"!

It will be observed that salvation is distinctly claimed to be *through the Church*. In order to show that the Church has this power, it is, of course, necessary to show in what way the Church obtained this power. To do this Scripture is quoted, though it is plainly stated elsewhere that the teaching of the Church has quite the same authority as Scripture. In fact, the teaching of the Church has far more authority than Scripture, for the Church claims the right to interpret Scripture, hence it is above Scripture.

The power of the Church is thus in-

sisted on; the minds of the young are so imbued with terror of disobedience to the Church that the marvel is not that so few leave the Church of Rome, but that any one ever leaves it.

In the quotation of texts of Scripture, Rome takes liberties with the Word of God, which certainly must bring on her the special condemnation pronounced on those who add to or take from that Word. I quote another question and answer from the same book in evidence of this:

"Q. How do we know that the Pope, as successor of St. Peter, possesses the gift of infallibility?

"A. We know it from Christ's own words (*sic*), for He told St. Peter that by His prayer to His Heavenly Father He had obtained this gift of infallibility for him and for all his successors."

Were there space to do so, I might quote passage after passage from Roman Catholic catechisms and books of authorized instruction, in daily use in this country, of a similar character. Thus the Roman Catholic child, at the earliest

moment of life, is impressed with the authority of the Church, and with the terror of disputing this authority, which its supposed Divine character demands. The Protestant child too often is left in hopeless ignorance, even of salvation through Christ.

Another source of external success in the Church of Rome is the insistence of attendance at her services, and the facilities which are given for such attendance. She relies, and not without reason, on the female portion of her flock both for material and spiritual support. Hence her early masses for the "help," which they are obliged to attend. Hence the homes and refuges for women, which are in the hands of sisters, and which are a powerful means of keeping the Church before the world and of keeping the working classes in constant touch with the priest. Is it not time for Protestants to be as zealous for Christ as Rome is for "the Church," and as zealous to convert the souls of the Romanist as the Romanist is to propagate his religion?

#### PREACHERS EXCHANGING VIEWS.

Conference, Not Criticism—Not a Review Section—Not Discussions, but Experiences and Suggestions.

##### The Fifth Petition.

In the HOMILETIC REVIEW for February, 1891, department of "Preachers Exchanging Views," J. O. B. "wants light" as to the teaching of the fifth petition of the Lord's Prayer, and its harmony with the other Scripture teaching: "Count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations."

J. O. B. has, of course, access to the commentaries; and I need not call his particular attention to any one of them save Meyer, who, of all the critics in hermeneutics, is conceded to be *facile princeps*. Meyer's explanation is: "God leads into temptation in so far as, in the course of His administration, He brings about a state of things that may lead to temptation—i. e., the situations and circum-

stances that furnish an occasion for sinning."

But as possibly throwing some light on the matter, I wish to call J. O. B.'s attention also to the following statement—viz., that in the Greek text of the Lord's Prayer every petition commences with the imperative mood and aorist tense, except the clause: *καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν* ("and lead us not into temptation"); which clause makes use of the aorist subjunctive. Is not this change in grammatical construction significant? Does not the use of the aorist imperatives—*ἀγαθὴν ἔλθέτω, γεννηθῆτω, δός, ἀφεῖς*—denote that the specific things desired will be certainly granted, the aorist—an achronic tense out of the indicative—

giving a vividness to the petitions as if already granted; while the aorist subjunctive, *πιστεύετε*, with the subjective negative, *μή*, conditions the realization of the petition on the will of God as shown in the issues of providence, and possibly also on the earnestness and importunity of our prayers? We are often tempted by surprises of evil, and have to meet a wily adversary. We may infer, accordingly, from the very construction that, since the petition is specially contingent our prayers should be specially importunate, that we may not be overcome by temptation, whatever this word may mean. In modern usage it means enticement to evil; but in the New Testament *πειρασμός* means sometimes *enticement to sin*, as in Luke iv. 13; 1 Tim. vi. 9; and sometimes

*test, or approval by test*, as in Mark xiv. 38; 1 Cor. x. 13; James i. 2; 1 Peter i. 6; 2 Peter ii. ix.

Does God, then, lead us into temptation? Yes and no. Yes—permissively and efficiently for the purpose of discipline (Mark v. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 11); No—*i.e.*, not efficiently for the purpose of alluring us to sin (James i. 13).

We see thus that Christians may properly count it joy to be tempted or tested; and yet, knowing their own weak and sinful natures, may pray not to be led into such stress of temptation as to imperil their integrity through lapse, or to wound their spirits by trials exceedingly hard to be borne.

JAMES B. FINCH.

AMAGANSETT, N. Y.

## EDITORIAL SECTION.

### LIVING ISSUES FOR PULPIT TREATMENT.

#### A Disease, a Sin, a Crime.

*Nor drunkards . . . shall inherit the Kingdom of God.*—1 Cor. vi. 10.

In a recent number of the *Independent* appeared an interesting symposium on the character of intemperance, as to whether it is to be regarded as a distinctively physical or moral ailment. There were contributions from those representing the medical and legal fraternities, and also from well-known individuals who have devoted themselves to efforts for the reformation of such of their fellows as have fallen victims to a passion for drink. As was to be expected, the views of the participants in the discussion were varied, and in some cases antagonistic. Some were inclined to regard the weakness as exclusively a disease of the physical nature, requiring medical treatment only in order to its cure; others to look upon it as a distinctively moral weakness, requiring spiritual remedies. The former minimized the personal responsibility

involved, by tracing the habit to heredity or environment; the latter magnified that responsibility by tracing the development of the habit to a native weakness of the will and corruptness of the individual heart. Among the latter, the manager of the "New York Christian Home for Intemperate Men," Mr. Charles A. Bunting, made the sweeping statement, supported by facts derived from a somewhat extensive observation, that the thirst for drink is not inherited; that intemperance is a sin for which the individual is exclusively responsible, and that it is the height of imprudence, to call it by no stronger name, to give any victim of the drink habit the idea that he can shift his responsibility to his antecedents.

We are inclined to regard both positions as true. There are, it seems to us, many cases in which consequences of parental indulgence are to be traced in the tendencies of children to a similar indulgence. At the same time, there

are very many cases in which the vice is distinctively individual, and involves no responsibility beyond that of the vicious individual himself. But what is to be kept in mind ever is that even in the former cases the responsibility for the wrongdoing remains with the individual doer of the wrong. Circumstances, we are wont to say, alter cases, and they undoubtedly do. But while they may tend to increase our charity for the wrongdoer, where there seems to be a congenital entail of evil, in the form of inherited weakness or passion, they do not for that reason excuse him in the doing of wrong. Every man stands on a plane with every other in his relation to Divine law. No excuse will avail for its violation. The race cannot throw the responsibility for its defection back upon its first parents, however true it may be that their act may have given its direction to the racial character. "Every one of us shall give account of himself unto God;" that is the Divine declaration, through the human medium, as to the relation of the individual to the decision at the tribunal of the Judge of all the earth. At that tribunal none can plead in extenuation of his own wrongdoing, "The fathers have eaten the sour grape, and the children's teeth have been set on edge;" in other words, individual responsibility cannot be shifted. The parent must give account for his own negligence or indulgence; and the child, though his wrongdoing may have been consequent upon parental negligence or indulgence, as fruit is consequent upon seed, must give account for that wrongdoing. In the eye of the Divine Lawgiver drunkenness is always sin, and therefore the universal declaration that "no drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God."

Treat as we may the physical evil and apply what we may of physical remedy, it is not to be forgotten that intemperance is a moral evil also and requires a moral remedy. An undermined will cannot be strengthened by physical medicaments or restraints. The organ through which that will operates may be renewed and assisted; but the will itself, with its tendency to choose the evil and refuse the good, can be made willing habitually to refrain from the evil and choose the good, only by the regenerative power of the Spirit of holiness. The drunkard can be made a new man in Christ Jesus and nowhere else.

It is not to be forgotten that drunkenness is not only a sin against Divine law, but in all civilized countries a crime against human law likewise. As such it should receive such a compensation in penalty as would give some idea of its enormity. Unfortunately it is now regarded and treated as little more than a peccadillo. Our courts are largely responsible for this estimate, and back of our courts, our legislative bodies, which set the possible limits of penalty. When it is remembered that drunkenness is the cause of the vast majority of the crimes committed by our criminal classes, it seems that wisdom would indicate that the true policy is to strike at these through it. While, therefore, favoring such physical treatment as the wisest of our medical profession may agree upon, and while beyond everything else urging the necessity of the most earnest efforts for the spiritual reclamation of the intemperate, we favor such treatment of intemperance at the hands of our law-executors as shall exhibit it in its true light as one of the most serious of all the crimes of which our statutes take cognizance.

#### EDITORIAL NOTES.

##### Federation.

THE opening of Prohibition Park, near Port Richmond, Staten Island, on

the fourth of last July, was an event the full significance of which cannot be appreciated as yet. It was what might be

called the initial step of a movement on the part of friends of moral reform toward the consolidation of forces, and their co-operation in contending against the great evils that are threatening our social and civil life, pre-eminently those that are consequent upon the traffic in strong drink. It is hoped that the Auditorium which, on the occasion alluded to, was formally and solemnly dedicated to the glory of God in the well being of men, may prove a rallying-point for the friends of truth and purity, and a place where many may receive inspiration for consecrated service in the sacred cause of temperance. But beyond the influence on the individual, it is desired that the place may help to realize that singleness of view and union of effort for which Dr. Hale and Dr. Johnson plead so earnestly in our Review Section—a union that shall involve no sacrifice of principle, not necessarily organic, but at least co-operative.

These are times in which "federation" is a cry to be heard in all directions—"federation" of religious denominations; "federation" of social organizations; "federation" of moral reform associations—this is everywhere "in the air." Let it crystallize from a diffused vapid expression into clear-cut, sharp-angled, definite endeavor. Let the word resolve itself into the work! This is the true order of development in the evolution of that which is worshipful—word-ship, work-ship, worth-ship, worship.

#### Minus Units of Heat.

THERE has recently been established in the neighborhood of Washington Market, New York City, a plant from which a current of cold air is to be supplied that will chill the three hundred and more refrigerators in the market stalls. According to the statement of one of those who have been perfecting the scheme, it is the purpose of the company to do "what the great steam distributing companies are doing, with a difference. What they are doing is to

distribute and sell plus units of heat. What we are doing is to distribute and sell minus units of heat."

These great companies are represented in a spiritual way in every church. There we have the plus and the minus units of heat in perpetual circulation; the plus stimulating, inspiring, quickening, energizing; the minus chilling, deadening, paralyzing; the plus active, positive, pushing ahead; the minus hypercritical, negative, holding back. The plus units seek their conversion; but they are not easily convertible. They keep, they intensify their chilliness, while they also communicate it; for this is one of the strange instances where having increases by giving. It is sometimes claimed for such that they represent the conservative element in our churches, and that the conservatism of a church is its preservation. But it is to be remembered that that which is cold preserves only that which is dead, and that heat is the invariable concomitant of life. More plus units of heat is what is wanted; more individuals baptized with the fire of the Spirit; more individuals so like the Master that contact with them shall be like that with Him in its results. "Was not our heart burning within us while He spake to us in the way?" More plus units would relieve many of our churches from the charge that they are characterized by a refrigerative coldness, and that their temperature is adapted to the preservation of a dead formalism but not of a living faith.

#### Reform in Funerals. I.

AMONG the evils that have come to be very common, especially in our cities and larger towns, is that of a costly and extravagant display in connection with the burial of the dead. That sorrow should desire an adequate expression of its intensity is natural. But that such an expression should involve an additional suffering to the living is most unmeet. Strange as it may seem, the costliest funerals are to be found among

those who can least afford them. Many are the instances in which the obligations contracted in the burial of the dead are unable to be met for months, sometimes for years, after the event. Expensive caskets, long trains of coaches, lavish floral displays, mean too often subsequent privation, anxiety, regret.

It is in the power of the readers of the HOMILETIC REVIEW, many of whom are in the pastoral office, to begin a work of reform in this particular, which is most needed, and will come to be regarded with gratitude by many. By encouraging the thought that simplicity and economy are a duty to the living, and so in no wise a disparagement of, but the highest honor to those who have passed away; by endeavoring to bring about such a change of sentiment in the arrangement of funeral services that it shall be regarded as becoming that only the immediate families of the dead shall be present at the interment; by reminding those whom sorrow is apt to blind to expediency and duty, that their example will have much to do with the action of those who are less fortunately circumstanced than themselves—this desirable end may be secured. Lavish display is always more or less barbaric, and rather befits the idea that death ends all than the more Christian one that Christ hath abolished death and brought life and immortality to light; while it is also most wasteful and the very unworthiest way of manifesting love for the dead or grief at their loss.

#### Ministers and Weddings.

THAT the vicious and criminal classes tend to propagate themselves is a well-known fact, and one in dealing with which great wisdom is needed. Society at large needs and demands protection against these classes. Just what that protection should be is a problem that is now engaging the thoughtful consideration of some of our most painstaking sociological students. The question is one to which the ministry should

give earnest thought, since they, as a class, have a large responsibility in the constitution of the family bond. It is true their function in the matter is mainly declarative. But they can do much to counteract the tendency of our times to a looseness in the estimate of the marital relation. We do not mean so much by their proclamations from the pulpit as to the dignity of that relation and the obligations of those who enter upon it, but by their dealing with those who apply to them for what is unworthily called the performance of the wedding ceremony. More caution is needed in regard to those who apply for this ministerial service. No little misery is often occasioned by an undue readiness to assent to the request of those who are utter strangers to the "officiating clergyman;" and no little reproach has been brought upon the ministry, as a class, by the indiscriminate acquiescence—perhaps we should say the criminal negligence—of certain of their number. As the commissioned servitors of a world's Saviour, they should regard themselves as set for the conservation of all worthy interests—and certainly there are none more comprehensive and important than those which are to be found in the life of the family, that essential and vital unit of the Church, and of the State as well.

#### Queries and Answers.

*Questions of general interest to clergymen will be printed in this department. The questions sent to us should be put in as brief forms as possible. Answers from our readers are requested. They must be (1) brief; (2) preceded by the number of the question to which they reply; (3) the name and address of the writer must accompany each answer. The name of a writer will not be published if we are requested to withhold it.*

1. What is sin against the Holy Ghost, and when committed? Please have this answered in HOMILETIC REVIEW. G. J. SCHUMACHER.
2. What is the custom in regard to *arms* and *flags* in a church during memorial services? Should *arms* be allowed in a church dedicated to God? Should the G. A. R. be allowed to hold their services, preceding the memorial services, in the church, with *covered* heads? W. T. W.

## BLUE MONDAY.

**The Best Parishioner.**

THE best I have met with on my first station. It was in Muskoka, a new part of the country. Most of the people were very poor. The man with whom I made my home had a large family. His farm being new, he could not raise half his bread, yet he paid \$2 a month for the minister's salary, and made him a home free for the year, and when I was leaving the station I was \$17 short of my salary, which was only \$160 a year. He placed in my hand a parcel, and told me not to open it till I got on the train. When I did so, I found it was \$17, the amount of my deficiency. He had sold one of his two only cows a day or two before, no doubt to raise it. The man is wealthy to-day.

J. J. N.

**The Meanest Parishioner.**

A MEMBER of the church of which I was pastor had a garden, on which he depended mainly for the support of himself and wife. The market being somewhat brisk in the time of green garden stuffs, my friend succeeded in selling all his green corn. Noticing that his pastor had a small patch of corn, he came to him one day, and said, "Elder, don't you want to sell your corn? I have been looking at it, and I think it is pretty good. If you like, I will sell it for you, and allow you a good commission." "Very well," I said, "Mr. A., you can try what you can do with it." The work was undertaken, and in about ten days or so friend A. approached me and said, "Well, Elder, I have sold your corn, and it has brought — dollars and — cents; what are you going to allow me for selling it?" My reply was, "Oh, I don't know; whatever you are allowed by others for such work, I am willing to allow you." "Well, Elder," was the reply, "I generally get half the proceeds for selling garden stuffs for people." "Very well, whatever you get from others you can take." The proceeds were then carefully divided by Mr. A. to a cent, and one half pocketed.

A. McD.

**Robbing Peter to Pay Paul.**

ONE of my parishioners, who estimated his wealth at about \$50,000, had been in the habit of promising to pay a certain sum toward the salary, but had for several years paid nothing. In fact, he had never been known to pay anything toward the church expenses. One day the pastor was preaching at a mission station. This man was present, but not in the house at the time of this occurrence. He was outside talking with a man who was just mandlin enough to feel very wealthy. So he pulled out a two-dollar bill, and proceeded to light his pipe. The bystanders interposed some objections, and suggested it would be far better to give it to the minister. "Oh, I'm too drunk to go into the house," said he. "Here, hand it to me, I'll give it to him," interrupted our "worthy parishioner." The fated bill was handed over to

his keeping, when he entered the house, and pushed his way up the aisle just as the congregation was passing out, and handing it to the preacher said, "Here are \$2: give me credit for the amount on my subscription." That is the only amount that ever was known to pass through his hands to the cause of Christ.

L. D. S.

**General Clerical Anecdote.**

THE writer had for his first pastorate a field in the beautiful Valley of Virginia. He made an appointment for a protracted meeting to be held in a school-house in a destitute section of the county. Near the school-house was the Poor House, or County Farm, as it was commonly called. The manager of the farm had a small head with a wealth of dry, powdery hair. This man was an enthusiastic Christian, and a leader in all spiritual work in his neighborhood.

Near the Poor House lived an old blacksmith who was always relied upon to start the tune in church services. On account of impaired sight he always provided himself with an extra lamp. During the progress of the aforesaid meeting much interest was awakened. People were saying that they never saw it "on this wise" before. Crowds were present. One night Bro. L—, the keeper of the Poor House, came early and took a seat well up in front; soon afterwards Bro. W—, the blacksmith, came in with his little lamp and seated himself immediately behind Bro. L—. In a short time the house was packed.

The writer went through with the opening service. Bro. W—, with his little lamp, led in singing. Just as the writer took his text, "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation," Bro. W— turned his wick so low that his lamp went out. As the preacher was nearing the close of his sermon he gave an invitation for penitents to come forward for prayer. Nine approached the front seat. While everything was at white heat he called upon Bro. W— to raise a hymn. The good old brother then for the first time learned that his lamp was out. Knowing the importance of time, he hurriedly struck a match, and whilst looking at the preacher attempted to light the wick, but instead of doing so lit old Bro. L—'s shaggy head. The conflagration was sudden and stupendous. The flame almost reached the little low ceiling. Two friends seated with him struck at the flame, but alas! they were too late. Every hair was gone. The transformation can better be imagined than described—one moment the great, shaggy head of the old saint, the next a little dapper, cymbaling head, covered with the dark gauzy reminiscences of a glorious past. Of course the preacher laughed—he didn't smile, he laughed. The congregation laughed; the penitents at the altar laughed; everybody laughed, except Bro. L—; he would not have laughed for the world.